



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 11, 2017

No. 116

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COMER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 11, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JAMES COMER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

HONORING FRANKLIN HOBSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Franklin Hobson for 60 years of service in the Fall Creek Volunteer Fire Department in Yadkin County.

Franklin was a young man of 21 when he became a charter member of the fire department in 1957. Since that time, he has been a dedicated leader in both the department and his community, including service as the Yadkin County

fire marshal. Still active in the Fall Creek Volunteer Fire Department today, he will celebrate his 82nd birthday on September 27.

It is volunteers like Franklin Hobson who help our Nation thrive. Through the generous example he has set, Franklin inspires others to think about ways they can give to their local community.

I thank Franklin for all of the good that he does for his community and for being a great example for all of us.

RECOGNIZING FALL CREEK VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT'S 60TH ANNIVERSARY

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 60th anniversary of the Fall Creek Volunteer Fire Department in Yadkin County.

The first meeting of these dedicated citizens was held on June 13, 1957, at Fall Creek Elementary School as 12 local men worked to establish the fire department. Its charter calls for 60 members, and its membership ranks have remained nearly full for 60 years. A pillar of the community, members have been awarded North Carolina's Order of the Long Leaf Pine on three occasions.

Helping others is one of the most honorable activities anyone can engage in, and this kind of selfless dedication to one's community is critical to the well-being of our country.

I thank the members of the Fall Creek Volunteer Fire Department for the selflessness and bravery they demonstrate as firefighters. America needs more courageous individuals like them to give of their time and talents to keep our communities safe.

FUNDING THE ENEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, today I have the front page cover of Douglas

Wissing's book, "Funding the Enemy: How U.S. Taxpayers Bankroll the Taliban." A few years ago, I had the pleasure of meeting with Douglas in my office here in D.C. to discuss his book.

One of the analyses of this book by the Publishers Weekly said: "'Funding the Enemy' is sober, sad, and important . . . it peels back the layers of American engagement in Afghanistan to reveal its rotten core: that United States dollars meant for that country's future instead fund the insurgency and support the Taliban. Paying for both sides of the war ensures America's ultimate defeat, and Wissing's book tells the story."

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of this book as we recently heard President Trump talk about how he would allow General Mattis to recommend troop level increases in Afghanistan. I am disappointed for many reasons. I am disappointed because Congress deserves a debate and a vote, and I am disappointed because we continue to lose American lives.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the administration of comments that President Trump made a few years ago regarding Afghanistan:

First, in August of 2011, he said that the United States was wasting lives and money in Iraq and Afghanistan.

In 2012, President Trump referred to Afghanistan as a "complete waste" and also declared it was "time to come home."

Then again the next year, he made many comments on the Twitter feed, first saying: "Do not allow our very stupid leaders to sign a deal that keeps us in Afghanistan through 2024—with all costs by USA."

He further tweeted: "Let's get out of Afghanistan. Our troops are being killed by the Afghanis we train and we waste billions there. Nonsense. Rebuild the USA."

That is what President Trump said, and I agree with President Trump.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5393

Returning to the book, "Funding the Enemy" shows: "With the vague intention of winning hearts and minds in Afghanistan, the U.S. Government has mismanaged billions of development and logistics dollars, bolstered the drug trade, and dumped untold millions into Taliban hands."

President Trump and Douglas Wissing clearly agree. Afghanistan is a failed policy.

Mr. Speaker, that is why Congressman JOHN GARAMENDI and I have introduced H.R. 1666, asking for a debate on Afghanistan and a new AUMF. You can vote against the bill, but the discussion is still needed. We are joined by at least 13 of our colleagues in support, and I hope more Members in both parties will join us. All we are asking for is a debate.

Mr. Speaker, the week before the Fourth of July, I handed a letter to Speaker RYAN asking for a debate, which I include in the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 27, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: First, let me commend you on your words regarding the need for Congress to find increased civility following the tragic shooting in Alexandria. Your words were very prophetic at this time in history.

Sir, respectfully, your recent response to my Afghanistan letter was very disappointing. At the time of my writing this, President Trump has decided to give troop level increase authority over to James Mattis. Now more than ever, it is time for a policy debate on the future in Afghanistan by the U.S. House of Representatives. The bill that I have introduced, H.R. 1666, would allow that debate.

Members of both parties are so frustrated by the 16 years we have spent in Afghanistan. Without further intervention by Congress, the loss of life and the waste of tax dollars in that country will continue. Sir, you have the authority as Speaker of the House to instruct the U.S. House committees to debate this conflict.

Let me close with a sentence from a recent email I received from the 31st Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Chuck Krulack: "[Afghanistan] is fragmented . . . tribal . . . controlled by war lords, economically a basket case, no real government outside of Kabul and that is questionable, a poorly organized and led Army (who will shoot at Americans as well as the 'enemy'), and no sense of what the country wants to be."

On behalf of all Americans who have died in Afghanistan, and the continued waste, fraud and abuse of money that persists, I respectfully ask how much longer will Congress do nothing? Please join in our effort to bring a debate to the House floor. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

WALTER B. JONES,
Member of Congress.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I said that if he doesn't read my letter, at least read the comments from the 31st Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, my friend and unofficial adviser, General Chuck Krulack. This is what I wanted PAUL RYAN to read, and I hope he did read it: "No one has ever con-

quered Afghanistan . . . and many have tried. We will join the list of nations that have tried and failed."

How prophetic is that, Mr. Speaker, that we will continue to go down this road and see this country spend and waste lives for absolutely nothing, known as Afghanistan?

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, my staff and I finished our 34th townhall in the home of one of America's greatest citizens: my mentor and my hero, Bob Dole. At every location we go, most often, several people ask me about the \$20 trillion of deficit this country has and our debt, the \$600 billion of deficit we have every year. Americans work too hard and there are too many worthwhile functions of government for the Federal Government to irresponsibly spend taxpayer dollars.

From the time I started thinking about running for office, it has been a priority of mine to help create a fiscally responsible plan to reduce our annual deficits and national debt. Yet again, this year, 70 percent of our budget is mandatory spending—70 percent of our budget is mandatory spending—and therefore is spent before the annual appropriations discussions even begin. If we hope to eliminate the deficit, we must address mandatory spending programs and be willing to engage in tough conversations.

This administration and Congress have taken steps to limit bureaucracy and rein in the size and scope of the Federal Government. In this spirit, we hope Congress stays true to this objective as we debate the upcoming budget in order to ensure that our limited taxpayer dollars are spent where they are most needed.

CLARK COUNTY, KANSAS

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring my colleagues up to date on my last visit to Clark County, Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues may remember that earlier this year wildfires consumed a vast sum of Clark County. The wildfires wrought havoc for many ranchers, farmers, families, and landowners in Clark County and across much of southwest Kansas, not to mention parts of Texas, Colorado, and Oklahoma. Besides the lives lost, including one in Kansas, thousands of livestock, 650,000 acres, and many family properties that had been passed down through generations burned in this disastrous blaze.

Through the perseverance of Kansans living in this region, a considerable amount of progress has been made since I visited right after the fires in March thanks to so many people throughout the country who donated hay as well as their personal services helping rebuild the hundreds of miles of fences that were burned down.

After visiting with the Giles family and the Grigsby family—both families impacted by the fires—their resilience, their strength, and their faith was made clear. These are the type of folks who are now working day in and day out to restore this section of the heartland.

I am delighted to see green rising in the pastures which was once scorched earth, burnt-to-the-ground grass. I am again reminded of the honor I have of working to represent some of the most hardworking Americans in the world: the Kansas agriculture, the Kansas farmers, and the Kansas ranchers.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving and gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We pray for the needs of the Nation, the world, and all of creation. Bless those who seek to honor You and serve each other and all Americans in this House through their public service. May the words and deeds of this place reflect an earnest desire for justice, and may men and women in government build on the tradition of equity and truth that represents the noblest heritage of our Nation.

These July days are busy, and the work to be done in the people's House is complicated—and very important. Bless all Members with a surfeit of energy, wisdom, patience, and firm resolve to do their best work for the benefit of all Americans.

May Your blessing, O God, be with us this day and every day to come, and may all we do be done for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) come forward and

lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. NORTON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S SUCCESSFUL G20 SUMMIT

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President Donald Trump's success during his overseas trip to Poland and the G20 summit in Germany makes it clear that America is once again the clear leader of the free world.

In Poland, the President reaffirmed that Western nations will stand together against threats to our security and our way of life. His remarks focused on his strategy of peace through strength—increasing defense spending, confirming our commitment to NATO, and promoting American energy as an alternative to Russian sources in Eastern Europe.

During the G20, President Trump made it clear that, under his leadership, America remains committed to blocking the funding of terrorism and extremism, empowering women across the world, affirming the right of nations to defend themselves, and pledging to end unfair trade. Additionally, working with other foreign leaders, he successfully negotiated a cease-fire in Syria.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Sadly, Canada has forgotten the 26 Canadians murdered on 9/11 by awarding millions of dollars to a confessed terrorist who killed U.S. Army Sergeant First Class Christopher Speer, putting American families and Canadian families at risk.

TRUMPCARE

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, despite attempts at resuscitation, TrumpCare is close to impasse, charitably speaking. The Senate bill does so much harm to all concerned—to Americans who depend on Medicaid or Medicare or have a preexisting condition, and actually raises costs out of pocket with less coverage while kicking 22 million people, including 61,000 D.C. residents, off their healthcare plans altogether—that some may be tempted to cheer the coming demise of TrumpCare.

Defeat of TrumpCare may be better than repeal of the Affordable Care Act, but to leave it there is to show contempt for the American people.

Republicans argue that ObamaCare was flawed because it was the product

of only one party. If so, Republicans should avoid the same mistake. The best way for Congress to spend the remaining weeks before recess is with Democrats and Republicans at the same table.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 392

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 392, a bill originally introduced by Representative Chaffetz of Utah, for the purposes of adding co-sponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING COLONEL JOE "SOLO" KUNKEL

(Mr. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding member of the United States Air Force, Colonel Joe "Solo" Kunkel. Solo has been selected for reassignment from Tyndall Air Force Base in the Second District of Florida, where he served as the vice commander of the 325th Fighter Wing.

He will continue his service at Mountain Home Air Force Base in Idaho as commander of the 366th Fighter Wing, the "Gunfighters."

Colonel Kunkel has been an exceptional leader at Tyndall, where he oversaw more than 4,000 people who train and support F-22 Raptor pilots and crews.

He has worked tirelessly to improve the lives of his officers, airmen, and their families. He improved mission performance, facilities, and family programs at Tyndall.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in extending congratulations and gratitude to Colonel Kunkel; his wife, Jenny; and their children, Madeline, Drew, Riley, and Brayden.

May God continue to bless our Nation with his kind of exemplary patriotism and service.

MAJORITY OF AMERICANS DO NOT TRUST THE MEDIA

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent NPR/PBS NewsHour/Marist poll found that a combined 68 percent of Americans said that they do not trust the media very much or not at all. The same poll also found that Americans trust President Trump more than the media.

It is no surprise that Americans do not trust the media. The media have stopped reporting and have started attacking. As The Federalist's David Harsanyi noted in a recent article, "News organizations have become obsessed with fighting the President rather than covering him."

A Harvard study recently found that 80 percent of the news coverage of President Trump in his first 100 days in office was negative, a new unfortunate record.

The media is so fixated on attacking the President that they rush to print unfounded stories using a single anonymous source.

Last month, three CNN employees resigned for their role in a botched Trump-Russia story. This debacle revealed the media's insatiable appetite to print any story—no matter how groundless—that is critical of the President.

The liberal media should stop fighting the President and start covering his Presidency in a fair and unbiased manner. Then they will regain the trust of the American people.

CONGRATULATING ERIN SMITH

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate 17-year-old Erin Smith of Shawnee Mission West High School in Overland Park in my district at home in Kansas.

Erin recently won the International BioGENEius Challenge held in San Diego, California, earning \$7,500 for her research with the award from the Biotechnology Institute.

The International BioGENEius Challenge pushes high school students from across the world to find solutions to healthcare, sustainability, and environmental needs through biotechnology.

Erin's research and work focused on Parkinson's disease which affects about 7 to 10 million people worldwide and about 60,000 new patients in America each year. Erin coded a website that can record the facial expressions of subjects using special software which enabled her to discover early indicators of Parkinson's disease. She then built an algorithm that could be used as a diagnostic tool.

Mr. Speaker, Erin sounds like one of the world's foremost researchers, but she is only a rising senior at Shawnee Mission West. She is truly incredible.

I congratulate her and wish her the best in what is just the beginning of a long journey helping many people living with this dreaded disease.

HONORING VICE ADMIRAL DIEGO "DUKE" HERNANDEZ

(Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand before the House today to recognize Vice Admiral Diego “Duke” Hernandez, a decorated war hero and patriot who passed away on Friday, July 7, at 83 years old.

Admiral Hernandez was born and raised in Puerto Rico, the son of two schoolteachers who became a three-star admiral and the highest ranking Hispanic officer in the United States Navy at the time. Throughout his distinguished 35-year career, he served as a commander to various naval forces earning the Silver Star, the Distinguished Flying Cross, and the Purple Heart. He exemplified the valor and commitment that his brothers in arms from Puerto Rico have demonstrated since the Great War.

On July 14, 1998, Admiral Hernandez testified before the Senate and highlighted Puerto Rican participation in our Nation’s wars and the reality of their marginalization from the democracy they fought to defend and uphold. He urged Congress to respond to the people of Puerto Rico so they can achieve political self-determination.

In his honor, I echo the same. Today, I ask the House to join me in expressing our profound gratitude to Admiral Hernandez and his contributions to the United States of America.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 11, 2017, at 10:00 a.m.:

Appointments:
Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

JULY 11, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Pursuant to section 703(c) of the Public Interest Declassification Act of 2000 (50 U.S.C.) 3161 note), I hereby appoint Mr. John F. Tierney of Massachusetts to the Public Interest Declassification Board.

Thank you for your consideration of this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOOLENAAR) at 4 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

MEDICAL CONTROLLED SUB- STANCES TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1492) to amend the Controlled Substances Act to direct the Attorney General to register practitioners to transport controlled substances to States in which the practitioner is not registered under the Act for the purpose of administering the substances (under applicable State law) at locations other than principal places of business or professional practice.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1492

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Medical Controlled Substances Transportation Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. REGISTRATION FOR TRANSPORT OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES TO STATES IN WHICH THE PRACTITIONER IS NOT REGISTERED UNDER THE CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADMINISTERING THE SUBSTANCES AT LOCATIONS OTHER THAN PRINCIPAL PLACES OF BUSINESS OR PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE.

Section 303 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) REGISTRATION FOR TRANSPORT OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES TO STATES IN WHICH THE PRACTITIONER IS NOT REGISTERED FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADMINISTERING THE SUBSTANCES AT LOCATIONS OTHER THAN PRIN-

CIPAL PLACES OF BUSINESS OR PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon application by a practitioner (other than a pharmacy) who is registered under subsection (f), the Attorney General shall issue a separate registration to the practitioner authorizing the practitioner—

“(A) to transport one or more controlled substances in schedule II, III, IV, or V from the practitioner’s registered location in a State to one or more States in which the practitioner is not registered under subsection (f) for the purpose of the practitioner administering the substances at locations other than a principal place of business or professional practice; and

“(B) to so administer the substances.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—For a practitioner to be authorized to transport and administer controlled substances pursuant to a registration issued under paragraph (1), all of the following conditions must be satisfied:

“(A) The practitioner must be licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted by the State in which the controlled substances are administered to carry out such activity at the location where it occurs.

“(B) The practitioner must—

“(i) limit the time of transport and administering of any controlled substance pursuant to such registration to not more than 72 consecutive hours; and

“(ii) by the conclusion of such 72 hours, return any such controlled substance so transported but not administered to the registered location from which such substance was obtained.

“(C)(i) The practitioner must maintain records of the transporting and administering of any controlled substance pursuant to this subsection.

“(ii) Such records shall be maintained, in accordance with the requirements of section 307(b), at the practitioner’s registered location from which the controlled substances were obtained and shall include—

“(I) the location where the controlled substance was administered; and

“(II) such other information as may be required by regulation of the Attorney General with respect to records for dispensers of controlled substances.

“(iii) Notwithstanding clause (ii), the exception in subsection 307(c)(1)(B) shall not apply to records required by this subparagraph.

“(3) GROUNDS FOR DENIAL OR REVOCATION.—The Attorney General may deny an application for registration under this subsection, or a renewal thereof, or revoke such registration, based on the criteria listed in section 304(a), except that the applicant shall not be required, as a condition of initially obtaining such registration, to present proof of State authorization to administer controlled substances.

“(4) AUTOMATIC TERMINATION.—A registration issued under this subsection shall automatically terminate if the practitioner no longer has an active registration under subsection (f) due to revocation, suspension, surrender, or other termination.

“(5) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘registered location’ means, with respect to each registration issued to a practitioner under subsection (f), the address that appears on the certificate of registration.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), who is the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation.

I want to thank the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. WALDEN from Hood River, Oregon, as well as the Health Subcommittee chairman, MICHAEL BURGESS from Lewisville, Texas. I appreciate Dr. BURGESS for yielding me time on this bill that is mine, that I presented several years ago, Mr. Speaker, that we are finally getting a chance to support today.

I wish to express my full support for H.R. 1492, the Medical Controlled Substances Transportation Act of 2017. This legislation represents commonsense reforms that will ensure certainty and regulatory clarity, while recognizing the needs of doctors, patients, and law enforcement alike. I hope Members on both sides recognize the need for not only this legislation, but will be in support.

Currently, physicians and other DEA-licensed medical practitioners are barred from transporting controlled substances from one practice setting to another. This is particularly strenuous on physicians who travel for their jobs. For example, team physicians at both the college and professional level have been particularly affected by the lack of clarity in the current law.

Physicians who travel with teams to away games carefully practiced transporting medicines—and they have done so for decades—in a manner that they believed to be in compliance with DEA regulations. Recently, however, there has been uncertainty surrounding this issue, as a number of teams have found themselves being challenged by the Drug Enforcement Administration.

Those physicians who had, for years, been in compliance, or felt like they were in compliance, were unable to provide players with proper medical care after many injuries while they were at an away game.

H.R. 1492 will allow physicians to obtain a separate mobile registration with the DEA for the ability to transport these very specific substances for medically relevant reasons directly related to the care of patients between practice settings. This registration allows for physician transport, up to 72 hours, while maintaining updated records of transport and the administration of these controlled substances. Such allowances would ensure that

physicians whose practices are inherently dynamic have the necessary provisions to provide care to their patients regardless of the setting.

I would like to thank the Drug Enforcement Administration for working with me and my office for the last 5 years on this important issue. I would also like to thank Dr. Dan Cooper, who is the lead physician for the Dallas Cowboys. I would like to thank the gentleman who owns the Dallas Cowboys, Mr. Jerry Jones, for standing up on behalf of professional teams and their players to ensure that we work together for a commonsense answer. I want to thank the gentleman, Dr. BURGESS, for yielding me the time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1492, the Medical Controlled Substances Transportation Act of 2017, authored by my good friend from Texas, the chairman of the Rules Committee, Representative PETE SESSIONS.

Whether it is emergency medical service providers traveling to a disaster area to provide care or a team physician at an away game, certain medical practitioners often need to travel with and administer antiseizure or pain medications.

Although many of these are regulated under the Controlled Substances Act, current law does not specifically authorize the transportation or administration of such substances away from their registered location. Currently, the Controlled Substances Act does not specifically authorize the transportation and the administration of controlled substances away from the location registered with the Drug Enforcement Administration.

In order to ensure appropriate oversight of this practice, H.R. 1492 would establish a separate registration process for mobile practitioners who are already registered with the DEA and in good standing.

For a practitioner to transport and administer controlled substances pursuant to this new registration, he or she must be licensed, registered, or otherwise permitted by the State in which the substances are administered to carry out such activity at the location where it occurs.

In addition, the practitioner must limit the time of transport to not more than 72 consecutive hours and return any such substances not administered to their registered location from which they were obtained.

Further, the practitioner must maintain records of the transporting and administering, and DEA would maintain the authority to deny or revoke a registration.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, June 24, 2017.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WALDEN: I write with respect to H.R. 1492, the “Medical Controlled Substances Transportation Act.” As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions within H.R. 1492 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I forego any further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1492 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1492 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1492.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, June 24, 2017.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for your letter concerning H.R. 1492, Medical Controlled Substances Transportation Act of 2017. I appreciate your willingness to forego any further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

I agree that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1492 at this time, the Judiciary Committee does not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation and that your Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that the Committee may address any remaining issues in its jurisdiction. I understand the Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and will support any such request.

I will include a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter in the Congressional Record during the Floor consideration of H.R. 1492.

Sincerely,

GREG WALDEN,
Chairman.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1492, the Medical Controlled Substances Transportation Act. This legislation will allow physicians, in agreement with the Drug Enforcement Agency, to transport and administer controlled substances to patients in another setting or disaster area.

Under current law, the Controlled Substances Act prohibits the transport

and storage of controlled substances away from the site that is registered with the DEA. This makes it illegal for athletic team doctors to transport a small amount of critical medications that may be needed to treat athletes while on the road.

Athletics are awfully important in Texas, and I think it is by luck of the draw—specifically, football—that you have three Texans today who want to make sure that our teams can have their doctors treat them. For equal time for my colleague from Dallas, I am sure this law would also provide for the Houston Texans, not just for the Dallas Cowboys.

It also complicates care for patients in emergency disaster areas where a doctor may want to offer their services during a crisis.

This bill would allow a physician to transport controlled substances to another practice setting or to a Presidentially declared disaster area if the physician is registered to dispense controlled substances listed on schedules II, III, IV, or V, and they enter into a specific agreement with the DEA.

The agreement would require a physician to provide advance notification to the DEA of any transport, identify the controlled substances to be transported and the locations to and from, the intended dates of transport, and the anticipated travel time. The physician is also required to maintain records in their primary practice setting on the dispensing of transported substances, and the duration of the agreement is limited to 72 hours.

As the Nation grapples with the ongoing prescription drug abuse crisis, these safeguards are important to ensuring appropriate use, while allowing doctors to treat patients where they are.

I want to thank the sponsor, Representative PETE SESSIONS, and the committee for their work to advance this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1492, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to commend Chairman SESSIONS for working on this important legislation with the Energy and Commerce Committee, the House Judiciary Committee, and the Drug Enforcement Administration to ensure that we got it right. This is a good bill with appropriate safeguards.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1492, the “Medical Controlled Substances Transportation Act of 2017.”

This bill amends the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) to direct the Attorney General to register practitioners to transport controlled substances to States in which the practitioner is not registered under the CSA to administer these substances at locations other than principal places of professional practice.

H.R. 1492 provides necessary guidance to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to clarify the requirements of physicians whose jobs inherently require transporting controlled substances.

By requiring the registration of practitioners who transport and administer controlled substances across state lines, this bill also increases oversight to ensure physicians are appropriately administering controlled substances to their patients.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1492 addresses a crucial element in America’s current opioid crisis regarding the mishandling of powerful prescription drugs by licensed physicians which can result in problems with addiction or abuse for patients.

This issue is particularly relevant in the arena of sports medicine, where specialized physicians are often required to swiftly treat athlete injuries while on the road.

In high-pressure environments, physicians and trainers sometimes prioritize athletic performance over physical and mental health, a mentality which has been shown to leave the door open for long-term, potentially devastating consequences for the players.

Earlier this year, a group of more than 1,800 former professional football players filed a federal lawsuit against all 32 teams of the National Football League (NFL) for allowing teams to violate federal laws governing the transportation, distribution, and administration of prescription drugs.

The lawsuit revealed a slew of dangerous, illegal practices within the NFL and individual teams, including the excessive administration and use of powerful painkillers and anti-inflammatory drugs as well as the failure of league and team officials to acknowledge or comply with guidance from the DEA.

In 2012, for instance, the average NFL team prescribed nearly 5,777 doses of anti-inflammatory drugs and 2,213 doses of controlled medications to its players.

The staggering levels of opioid use in the NFL have led to a number of chronic health problems for many former players who continue to suffer from long-term organ and joint damage years or even decades after they have retired.

Even more troubling, a 2011 survey of 644 retired players found that 7 percent were still actively using opioid drugs in retirement—more than four times the rate of opioid use in the general population.

National sports leagues like the NFL are massive, multi-billion dollar industries that drive many local economies in the United States; last year, the average NFL team was worth \$2.3 billion and employed 3,739 people.

However, it is vital that we recognize the human cost of this highly profitable business.

With the immense economic and cultural value of America’s sports teams and athletes in mind, the federal government should take all necessary measures to ensure that fans and players are able to enjoy their favorite past-times safely and fairly.

H.R. 1492 is a crucial step in improving the DEA’s ability to protect prescription drug recipients who are vulnerable to misusing or abusing painkillers and other powerful medications.

Fixing our national opioid epidemic is a bipartisan cause, and I am confident that this legislation has the potential to effect powerful and positive change for large numbers of Americans.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1492.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1492.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE ANTIDISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 702) to amend the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 to strengthen Federal antidiscrimination laws enforced by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and expand accountability within the Federal Government, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 702

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

Section 102 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), to read as follows: “(4) accountability in the enforcement of Federal employee rights is furthered when Federal agencies take appropriate disciplinary action against Federal employees who have been found to have committed discriminatory or retaliatory acts;” and

(2) in paragraph (5)(A)—

(A) by striking “nor is accountability” and inserting “but accountability is not”; and

(B) by inserting “for what by law the agency is responsible” after “under this Act”.

SEC. 3. NOTIFICATION OF VIOLATION.

Section 202 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) NOTIFICATION OF FINAL AGENCY ACTION.—

“(1) Not later than 30 days after a Federal agency takes final action or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission issues an appellate decision involving a finding of discrimination or retaliation prohibited by a provision of law covered by paragraph (1) or (2) of section 201(a), as applicable, the head of the agency subject to the finding shall provide notice for at least 1 year on the agency’s Internet Web site in a clear and prominent location linked directly from the agency’s Internet home page stating that a finding of discrimination or retaliation has been made.

“(2) The notification shall identify the date the finding was made, the date or dates

on which the discriminatory or retaliatory act or acts occurred, and the law or laws violated by the discriminatory or retaliatory act or acts. The notification shall also advise Federal employees of the rights and protections available under the respective provisions of law covered by paragraph (1) or (2) of section 201(a).”

SEC. 4. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) ELECTRONIC FORMAT REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 203(a) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended—

(A) by inserting “Homeland Security and” before “Governmental Affairs”;

(B) by inserting “Oversight and” before “Government Reform”; and

(C) by inserting “(in an electronic format prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management)” after “an annual report”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1)(C) shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) TRANSITION PERIOD.—Notwithstanding the requirements of section 203(a) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note), the report required under such section may be submitted in an electronic format, as prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the effective date in paragraph (2).

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENT FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION.—Section 203 of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) DISCIPLINARY ACTION REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which a Federal agency takes final action or a Federal agency receives an appellate decision issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission involving a finding of discrimination or retaliation in violation of a provision of law covered by paragraph (1) or (2) of section 201(a), as applicable, the employing Federal agency shall submit to the Commission a report stating whether disciplinary action has been initiated against a Federal employee as a result of the violation.”

SEC. 5. DATA TO BE POSTED BY EMPLOYING FEDERAL AGENCIES.

Section 301(b) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (9)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) for each such finding counted under subparagraph (A), the agency shall specify—

“(i) the date of the finding;

“(ii) the affected agency;

“(iii) the law violated; and

“(iv) whether a decision has been made regarding necessary disciplinary action as a result of the finding.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(11) Data regarding each class action complaint filed against the agency alleging discrimination or retaliation, including—

“(A) information regarding the date on which each complaint was filed;

“(B) a general summary of the allegations alleged in the complaint;

“(C) an estimate of the total number of plaintiffs joined in the complaint if known;

“(D) the current status of the complaint, including whether the class has been certified; and

“(E) the case numbers for the civil actions in which discrimination or retaliation has been found.”

SEC. 6. DATA TO BE POSTED BY THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION.

Section 302(b) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended by striking “(10)” and inserting “(11)”.

SEC. 7. NOTIFICATION AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEE ANTIDISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION ACT AMENDMENTS.

(a) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—The Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended by adding after section 206 the following:

“SEC. 207. COMPLAINT TRACKING.

“Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act of 2017, each Federal agency shall establish a system to track each complaint of discrimination arising under section 2302(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code, and adjudicated through the Equal Employment Opportunity process from inception to resolution of the complaint, including whether a decision has been made regarding necessary disciplinary action as the result of a finding of discrimination.

“SEC. 208. NOTATION IN PERSONNEL RECORD.

“If a Federal agency takes an adverse action covered under section 7512 of title 5, United States Code, against a Federal employee for an act of discrimination or retaliation prohibited by a provision of law covered by paragraph (1) or (2) of section 201(a), the agency shall, after all appeals relating to such action have been exhausted, include a notation of the adverse action and the reason for the action in the employee’s personnel record.”

(b) PROCESSING AND REFERRAL.—The Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE IV—PROCESSING AND REFERRAL

“SEC. 401. PROCESSING AND RESOLUTION OF COMPLAINTS.

“Each Federal agency is responsible for the fair, impartial processing and resolution of complaints of employment discrimination and retaliation arising in the Federal administrative process and shall establish a model Equal Employment Opportunity Program that—

“(1) is not under the control, either structurally or practically, of a Human Capital or General Counsel office;

“(2) is devoid of internal conflicts of interest and ensures fairness and inclusiveness within the organization; and

“(3) ensures the efficient and fair resolution of complaints alleging discrimination or retaliation.

“SEC. 402. NO LIMITATION ON HUMAN CAPITAL OR GENERAL COUNSEL ADVICE.

“Nothing in this title shall prevent a Federal agency’s Human Capital or General Counsel office from providing advice or counsel to Federal agency personnel on the processing and resolution of a complaint, including providing legal representation to a Federal agency in any proceeding.

“SEC. 403. HEAD OF PROGRAM REPORTS TO HEAD OF AGENCY.

“The head of each Federal agency’s Equal Employment Opportunity Program shall report directly to the head of the agency.

“SEC. 404. REFERRALS OF FINDINGS OF DISCRIMINATION.

“(a) EEOC FINDINGS OF DISCRIMINATION.—Not later than 30 days after the Equal Em-

ployment Opportunity Commission issues an appellate decision involving a finding of discrimination or retaliation within a Federal agency, the Commission shall refer the matter to the Office of Special Counsel.

“(b) REFERRALS TO SPECIAL COUNSEL.—The Office of Special Counsel shall accept and review a referral from the Commission under subsection (a) for purposes of seeking disciplinary action under its authority against a Federal employee who commits an act of discrimination or retaliation.

“(c) NOTIFICATION.—The Office of Special Counsel shall notify the Commission in a case in which the Office of Special Counsel initiates disciplinary action.

“(d) SPECIAL COUNSEL APPROVAL.—A Federal agency may not take disciplinary action against a Federal employee for an alleged act of discrimination or retaliation referred by the Commission under this section except in accordance with the requirements of section 1214(f) of title 5, United States Code.”

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended—

(1) by inserting after the item relating to section 206 the following:

“Sec. 207. Complaint tracking.

“Sec. 208. Notation in personnel record.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE IV—PROCESSING AND REFERRAL

“Sec. 401. Processing and resolution of complaints.

“Sec. 402. No limitation on Human Capital or General Counsel advice.

“Sec. 403. Head of Program reports to head of agency.

“Sec. 404. Referrals of findings of discrimination.”

SEC. 8. NONDISCLOSURE AGREEMENT LIMITATION.

Section 2302(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (13)—

(A) by inserting “or the Office of Special Counsel” after “Inspector General”; and

(B) by striking “implement” and inserting “(A) implement”; and

(C) by striking the period that follows the quoted material and inserting “; or”; and

(2) by adding after subparagraph (A), as added by paragraph (1)(B), and preceding the flush left matter that follows paragraph (13), the following:

“(B) implement or enforce any nondisclosure policy, form, or agreement, if such policy, form, or agreement prohibits or restricts an employee from disclosing to Congress, the Office of Special Counsel, or an Office of the Inspector General any information that relates to any violation of any law, rule, or regulation, or mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial, and specific danger to public health or safety, or any other whistleblower protection.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 702, the Federal Employee Anti-discrimination Act of 2017, introduced by my colleague on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, the ranking member, ELIJAH CUMMINGS.

I should note that Mr. CUMMINGS is unable to be with us here today for this important bill. He is recuperating from surgery, and we wish him a speedy recovery.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 702 amends the Notification and Federal Employee Anti-discrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002, or the NO FEAR Act, to better identify and correct issues of discrimination throughout the Federal Government. Ranking Member CUMMINGS introduced H.R. 702 in response to problems identified in the Baltimore office of the Social Security Administration.

The bill requires Federal agencies to establish a system to track Equal Employment Opportunity complaints from beginning to end. This system must also track any disciplinary action that resulted from a finding of a discriminatory act.

□ 1615

The bill also requires both the disciplinary action and the reason for the action to be included in the employee's personnel record.

Mr. Speaker, this bill implements notification and reporting requirements for instances of discrimination within Federal agencies. Agencies must provide a notice on an internal website if the agency or Equal Employment Opportunity Commission finds that a discriminatory or retaliatory act has occurred.

The bill requires agencies to submit a report to the EEOC if such an act has occurred. The report must include any disciplinary action initiated against an employee for discrimination or retaliation against another employee.

Lastly, the bill bars agencies from using nondisclosure agreements to restrict Federal employees from reporting waste, fraud, and abuse to Congress, the Office of Special Counsel, and Inspector General.

I thank Mr. CUMMINGS for his work on this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 702, the Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act of 2017, as amended.

I also thank my good friend, Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS, for his work on this measure and for his leadership and passion of our committee's ongoing efforts to ensure that Federal equal opportunity programs truly guarantee equal opportunity.

Most agencies are careful to ensure that their personnel policies protect employees' rights and that their EEO programs ensure that if discrimination does occur, employees can seek fair and timely redress.

Unfortunately, there have been instances in which agencies fail to meet the standards of a model EEO program. When that occurs, hardworking Federal employees are harmed.

For example, during the last Congress, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform conducted a number of hearings to examine how allegations of harassment and retaliation were handled at the National Park Service and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, including the Forest Service.

In the case of the Park Service, a former superintendent of the Grand Canyon, one of our premier parks, received a report in 2013 documenting multiple allegations of sexual harassment. But rather than determining whether further investigation was warranted or disciplinary action should be pursued, the superintendent attempted to bury the report.

A year later, more than a dozen current and former employees sent their allegations directly to the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary referred those allegations to the Inspector General. After an extensive investigation, the IG found "a long-term pattern of sexual harassment and a hostile work environment" at the Grand Canyon River District.

The Inspector General's Office also identified more than 20 other individuals who "reported experiencing or witnessing sexual harassment and hostile work environments," and the IG confirmed that previous reports of sexual harassment "were not properly investigated or reported."

As disturbing as these findings are, the Inspector General has also found instances of sexual harassment and retaliation at other parks, including iconic places like Yellowstone National Park and the Canaveral National Seashore.

While the Park Service has announced measures to address the serious shortcomings in its EEO programs, it is clear that deficiencies in these programs are longstanding and have hurt numerous employees.

Similar chronic problems have occurred at the Department of Agriculture. The EEO program there has now been the subject of two extraordinary letters sent by the Office of Special Counsel to the President of the United States.

In May 2015, the Special Counsel wrote to warn the President that USDA's civil rights program "has been seriously mismanaged, thereby compromising the civil rights of USDA employees."

Just last month, the Office of Special Counsel wrote again to the President, finding that "while the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights has taken positive steps to improve its

performance, based on the significant number of cases that are still subject to delays, OSC has determined that the agency response is unreasonable in part. USDA may need to devote more resources to the Office to ensure that cases are promptly processed and hold senior supervisors accountable for the mismanagement in this office."

Such findings are not to be tolerated, and they highlight why this bill, H.R. 702, the Federal Employee Anti-discrimination Act, is urgently needed.

This measure would require that the head of an agency's EEO program report directly to the head of the agency himself or herself. The measure would also require that an agency's EEO program be operated independently of its human resources or general counsel offices, ensuring that the EEO program is focused solely on protecting the civil rights of all employees and applicants.

H.R. 702 would strengthen the accountability mechanisms central to the effectiveness of the EEO process. For example, the bill would expand the notifications that agencies are required to provide when discrimination is indeed found to have occurred, and it would require agencies to track and report whether such findings resulted in any disciplinary action.

The bill would also prohibit agencies from attempting to gag employees by banning policies, forms, or agreements that seek to prohibit or restrict an employee from disclosing to Congress, the Office of Special Counsel, or an Office of the Inspector General any information that might relate to a violation of any law, rule, regulation, or waste, fraud, or abuse.

H.R. 702 is essentially identical to the bill we considered in the last Congress, which passed the House by a vote of 403-0. I urge Members to support the measure again.

As I close, Mr. Speaker, I join with Ranking Member CUMMINGS in urging the Senate to move on this measure as expeditiously as possible, without the addition of extraneous and harmful amendments that might seek to curtail due process rights of Federal employees.

Any employee who engages in discriminatory or retaliatory behavior or who harasses another employee must be held accountable. The American public expects no less. Current personnel policies and practices are adequate to ensure that this can occur, and there is no need for any amendment to this bill that would undermine or weaken employees' due process rights.

Mr. Speaker, I talked to Representative ELIJAH CUMMINGS recently. He is doing great. He is full of fight and can't wait to get back here to Congress. We expect to see him shortly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I wish Mr. CUMMINGS a speedy recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 702, the Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act of 2017, as amended.

I thank all of the bill's co-sponsors, including Representatives NORTON, SENSENBRENNER and JACKSON LEE, for working with me on this measure and for their commitment to strengthening federal Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) programs.

I also thank Tanya Ward Jordan, Paulette Taylor, and all the members of the Coalition 4 Change (C4C) for their years of work on this measure and their perseverance.

H.R. 702 is essentially identical to H.R. 1557, which was considered in the last Congress. That legislation passed the House by a vote of 403–0. However, the bill did not pass the Senate before the end of the 114th Congress. I am hopeful that this year, we can finally get this measure over the finish line and to the President's desk for signature.

I authored H.R. 702 to make long-overdue reforms of federal EEO programs to ensure that they are better able to protect the rights of federal employees and applicants for federal employment.

Federal EEO programs exist to uphold the guarantee of equal opportunity that is the right of every citizen in this nation and to ensure that any barriers impeding fairness in personnel decisions are identified and eliminated.

While the vast majority of federal workplaces comply with current EEO requirements, some federal agencies still have not met the standards of a model EEO program set forth by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).

For example, in 2014, the EEOC issued a report on the Social Security Administration (SSA) that made 12 findings regarding SSA's failure to maintain a model EEOC program, ensure efficient management of the complaint process, provide uniform training to ensure equal opportunities, and implement effective and efficient anti-harassment policies and procedures.

The EEOC made more than 60 recommendations for reform of that one program alone.

Last year, bi-partisan investigations conducted by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the National Park Service and the U.S. Forest Service found significant deficiencies in both agencies' EEO programs.

At both agencies, employees suffered when their complaints of discrimination were not handled in a fair and timely manner. Employees were also harmed by agencies' failure to safeguard complainants' personal information.

To help end these failings, my bill would require that EEO programs operate independently of an agency's human resources or general counsel offices—and that the head of the program reports directly to the head of an agency. This would ensure that effective implementation of the EEO program is prioritized at the highest level of an agency—and that it operates with the sole purpose of ensuring equal opportunity for all employees.

H.R. 702 would also strengthen the accountability mechanisms that are central to the effectiveness of the EEO process.

Further, H.R. 702 would make clear that agencies cannot impose any nondisclosure agreement on federal employees to prohibit employees from disclosing fraud or illegal ac-

tions to Congress, the Office of Special Counsel (OSC), or an Inspector General.

According to the 2014 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey, only 60 percent of federal employees agreed that they could, quote, “disclose a suspected violation of any law, rule or regulation without fear of reprisal.”

The Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act would help ensure that federal employees can report discrimination without suffering retaliation—and that such reports will be thoroughly and fairly investigated and adjudicated in a timely manner.

Finally, as I close, I want to address some of the issues that arose during consideration of this measure in the Senate Homeland Security Committee last year.

I want to be crystal clear that I believe that supervisors who engage in discriminatory or retaliatory action must be held accountable.

However, this can be accomplished without curtailing any existing due process rights for federal employees and I will continue to oppose all efforts to roll back any due process right.

I urge all Members to support H.R. 702, and I hope that in this Congress, we can finally enact this measure into law.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 702, the “Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act of 2017.”

I support this legislation because it ensures agencies effectively implement their Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) programs and that federal employees are never prevented from disclosing discriminatory or wasteful actions to Congress, the Office of Special Counsel, or Inspectors General.

Let me express my thanks to Ranking Member Cummings for introducing this critical legislation that is essential to ensuring that our federal workplaces are free from discrimination, and that any barriers impeding fairness in personnel decisions are identified and eliminated.

This is not the first time we have addressed and offered legislation regarding workplace equality.

In 2002, the “No Fear Act” was first introduced in Congress and set the precedent for imposing additional duties upon Federal agency employers that are intended to reinvigorate their longstanding obligation to provide a work environment free of discrimination and retaliation.

On October 2, 2000, the House Science Committee held a hearing entitled “Intolerance at EPA—Harming People, Harming Science?”

Dr. Marsha Coleman-Adebayo, an EPA whistleblower, won a 600,000 dollar jury decision against EPA for race and sex discrimination under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

During that hearing, then-chairman of the Science Committee Congressman Sensenbrenner illuminated the dangerous precedent set by the EPA, stating, “While EPA has a clear policy on dealing with employees that discriminate, harass and retaliate against other EPA employees, no one apparently involved in the Coleman-Adebayo or Nolan cases have yet to be disciplined by EPA.”

Mr. Speaker, no employee should fear voicing their concerns in reference to a safer more work conducive environment.

According to the 2014 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey, only 60 percent of federal employees agreed that they could quote, “dis-

close a suspected violation of any law, rule or regulation without fear of reprisal.”

We must do better and ensure employees have confidence that they can report an act of discrimination without suffering retaliation.

Employees need to know that EEO reports will be thoroughly, fairly, and timely investigated and adjudicated.

H.R. 702 would require that EEO programs operate independently of an agency's human resources or general counsel offices.

This bill requires the head of the program report directly to the head of an agency and the act would prohibit the use of non-disclosure agreements that restrict an employee from disclosing to Congress, the Office of Special Counsel, or instance of waste, fraud or abuse.

We often look at individuals or groups who step forward as whistleblowers.

This term has been used with a negative connotation to describe insubordinate employees, but history has shown us that whistleblowers are often heroes that have shed light on employers' illegal practices and as a result made the workplace better for future employees.

Mark Felt, the FBI agent known as deep throat during the Watergate Scandal of the 1970s.

Frank Serpico, New York police officer who confronted his department for the rampant corruption the leadership let take place.

Jeffrey Wigand, a tobacco executive who admitted that tobacco companies knew they were putting addictive chemicals into their cigarettes.

And Sherron Watkins, an executive of the Enron corporation who was vital in exposing the financial lies and frauds of the company.

All these individuals stood up against well-established corporations and agencies even when others doubted their claims.

We must protect these types of acts in Federal offices and successfully implement the Equal Employment Opportunity Programs (EEO).

Mr. Speaker, in a sense every Member of Congress is a whistleblower for the people in that uncovering and correcting problems in the agencies that administer the laws is an essential part of our oversight responsibilities.

As a senior member of the Committees on Homeland Security and the Judiciary, and as Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I understand the importance of safe and discrimination free workplaces.

By strengthening existing requirements to ensure federal EEO programs meet high standards, we are implementing the best practices available to combat workplace discrimination.

It is our duty as Members of Congress to be whistleblowers, bring attention to this pressing matter, and put a stop to injustices occurring in the workforce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 702, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MERLE HAGGARD POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1988) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1730 18th Street in Bakersfield, California, as the “Merle Haggard Post Office Building”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1988

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. MERLE HAGGARD POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1730 18th Street in Bakersfield, California, shall be known and designated as the “Merle Haggard Post Office Building”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Merle Haggard Post Office Building”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1988, which designates a post office in Bakersfield, California, as the Merle Haggard Post Office Building.

Merle Haggard once sang about being a “branded man out in the cold” because, having served time in prison, “no matter where I travel, the black mark follows me, I’m branded with a number on my name.” He lamented that: “If I live to be a hundred, guess I’ll never clear my name.”

Well, Merle didn’t quite make it to 100, but it is safe to say that the people of Bakersfield will appreciate seeing the post office bear the name of Merle Haggard. Merle can hold his head up and be proud of who he was.

Now this will be a time for celebration, but remember: “We don’t smoke marijuana in Muskogee; we don’t take no trips on LSD.” So in honor of the Okie from Muskogee, illicit substances will be prohibited at the Haggard Post Office. It will be okay to just stay there and drink, but keep in mind that tonight could be the night the bottle let’s you down.

We would also appreciate if people refrain from burning draft cards on Main Street, and please don’t let your “hair grow long and shaggy” at the Merle Haggard Post Office. Waving Old Glory down at the courthouse will, of course, be encouraged.

Now, Merle didn’t always make it easy for people, particularly his mother. His mother did everything she could to raise him right, but Merle didn’t listen. So, like others, he turned 21 in prison, doing life without parole, and that left only Merle to blame because “Mama tried, Mama tried.”

Merle appreciated all our fighting men and women who fought and died to keep America free. Merle was right to ask if we can really count on being free if we have to depend on “some squirrely guy who claims he just” doesn’t believe in fighting.

Merle was a patriot who loved this country. If you don’t love it, then just leave it. But be warned: “When you are running down my country hoss, you are walking on the fighting side of me. . . .”

May God bless Merle Haggard.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, that was a hard act to follow. I was transported to the 1960s. I was always a fan of Merle Haggard, but not necessarily his political philosophy. I don’t believe the proposition that if you disagree with the policies of your government, you have to leave the country. I actually believe the beauty of America is that you get to disagree, you get to respectfully dissent, and you still get to live here as a full-fledged American.

I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of this bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service in Bakersfield, California, as the Merle Haggard Post Office Building.

Merle was born in Bakersfield in 1937, and, as my friend from Florida said, took a circuitous route to becoming “the poet of the common man,” as he was known.

As a teenager, he often found himself in reform school after committing petty crimes. By the age of 20, he was serving time, as Mr. DESANTIS said, in a California prison. It was that experience, however, that helped him turn his life around.

In prison, Merle Haggard rediscovered his love of music, and later put his talent to work on the Bakersfield club circuit. By singing about poverty, the struggles of the ordinary man and woman, and how music saved him during dark times, he captured the imagination and the attention of the entire country, and had 38 number one country hits.

In 1994, Merle was inducted into the Country Music Hall of Fame. In 2010, he received a Kennedy Center Honors from President Barack Obama. After a

long and fulfilling life, Merle died on his 79th birthday in April of last year.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to recognize the incredible accomplishments to our culture that Merle Haggard represents to celebrate his country music and his ability to give a voice to working men and women everywhere who keep their “nose on the grindstone” and “work hard every day.”

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 1988, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am from California, but I happen to be from Bakersfield, California. I thank the gentleman for his creative use of the lyrics. Merle would be proud.

Mr. Speaker, when you take a look back at American history, you can see figures standing tall who spoke for the everyday working man. Following the long tradition of Whitman and Twain, Merle Haggard was a man who knew America instinctively because he lived an American life. It wasn’t a life of the movies, but it was all the more compelling because it was all the more real. That is the reason they called him “The Poet of the Common Man.”

Merle Haggard didn’t have it easy. At the height of the Depression, his family searched for opportunity out West. Merle grew up with little means and lived with a past of mistakes and regrets.

So he sang. He sang in “Branded Man” of the stigma of prison, crooning “I held my head up high, determined I would rise above the shame.”

He sang in “Working Man Blues” of the grind of doing his duty to his family, “working as long as my two hands are fit to use.”

And he sang of his roots, not of power or wealth or status, but of pride in being “an Okie from Muskogee,” a place of leather boots, football, and Old Glory.

He found success and, more importantly, redemption in the music he shared with his country.

Now, the Bakersfield Sound changed country music, and it is a testament to Merle Haggard’s talent that when you listen to his hits, from “Branded Man” to “Mama Tried,” to “Big City,” to “Working Man Blues,” or even to “Okie from Muskogee,” you not only hear the hardship and wisdom of a well-lived life, but you can hear the roots of so much of the music we still listen to today.

From a man who went from Bakersfield High School to San Quentin prison, to the Country Music Hall of Fame, a building doesn’t seem like much. But I hope that when people pass by the Merle Haggard Post Office Building in

downtown Bakersfield, they will remember an icon of our community, an artist who never backed down, a man whose honesty above his own failings and willingness to pick himself back up inspired music that lifts our spirits and feeds our souls.

Merle Haggard's name will live on in this building, but his spirit will live on in his music that calls us to do the best we can every day God gives us.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on this side. I just want to echo the sentiments of Mr. MCCARTHY, the majority leader, in honoring a great artist who overcame enormous obstacles in his life to achieve great success and to make contributions to American culture.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 954.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF USE RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN LAND TRANSFERRED TO ROCKINGHAM COUNTY, VIRGINIA

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 954) to remove the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 954

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REMOVAL OF USE RESTRICTION.

Public Law 101-479 (104 Stat. 1158) is amended—

(1) by striking section 2(d); and

(2) by adding the following new section at the end:

“SEC. 4. REMOVAL OF USE RESTRICTION.

“(a) The approximately 1-acre portion of the land referred to in section 3 that is used for purposes of a child care center, as authorized by this Act, shall not be subject to the use restriction imposed in the deed referred to in section 3.

“(b) Upon enactment of this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall execute an instrument to carry out subsection (a).”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 954, offered by our colleague, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Congressman BOB GOODLATTE of Virginia, would remove certain deed restrictions on an approximately 1-acre portion of a property previously transferred in Rockingham County, Virginia, under the terms of the National Park Service's Federal Lands to Parks Program. The transferred land included a garage that had previously been used by the National Park Service.

Following the transfer, Rockingham County decided that the nonprofit Plains Area Daycare Center, which provides affordable childcare for nearly 100 children, would benefit from use of the garage.

In 1990, Congress passed a law allowing for a portion of the previously transferred land to be used for the childcare center. Although a portion of the transferred property is authorized for use as a daycare center, the center encounters hurdles in securing financing for improvements and repairs due to the terms of the original deed and the subsequent legislation.

H.R. 954 would remove certain deed restrictions from an approximately 1-acre portion of the property, while the other 2 acres would continue to be subject to the existing deed restrictions and revisionary clause. Removal of these deed restrictions will ensure that improvements and repairs can take place without further delay in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 954 removes the use restrictions on a 1-acre parcel of Federal land provided to Rockingham County, Virginia.

In 1989, Congress authorized Rockingham County to use a 3-acre parcel of Federal land for the purpose of establishing a childcare center under the condition that the land continues to be used for this purpose. If the county no longer needs the land for a childcare center, the land reverts back to ownership by the United States or the county has the option to purchase it at a fair market value.

The Federal Government has a long tradition of providing public land to State, county, and local governments. Fair use of Federal land and a fair return to the American taxpayer has yet to be at the forefront of these transactions.

Removing public-purpose requirements and use restrictions should only

be done when it is deemed appropriate and necessary, and in this particular case, the sponsor of this bill has worked with the National Park Service to develop legislation that is both fair and transparent.

The land provided to Rockingham County includes a garage previously used by the National Park Service that the county has determined could benefit Plains Area Daycare Center. The Park Service no longer needs the garage, and removing the use restriction on one of the 3 acres will allow this childcare provider to access financial assistance in order to upgrade and rehabilitate the garage so that it is suitable to their needs.

This is a worthy goal, and I commend the gentleman from Virginia for this legislation, and that is why we support the adoption of H.R. 954.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me and for his work on this bill, as well as Chairman BISHOP's work on this legislation and those on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge passage of H.R. 954. This bill simply removes 20-year-old deed use restrictions on 1 acre of land in Rockingham County, Virginia.

For over 25 years, a little over 3 acres of land and its associated buildings previously held by the Federal Government have been maintained by Rockingham County in the Plains Area Daycare Center in the Sixth District of Virginia.

In 1989, the Federal Government deeded these 3 acres of land, with restriction, to Rockingham County. However, even prior to this official declaration, Rockingham County had already been faithfully maintaining the property no longer utilized by the Federal Government.

The government transferred this land to Rockingham County in 1989 under the condition that this property was to be used for public purposes. The county then decided that the nonprofit Plains Area Daycare Center in Broadway, Virginia, which provides childcare on a sliding scale to many families who otherwise could not afford such a service, would benefit from the use of the old garage located on the property.

Therefore, in 1990, Congress enacted Public Law 101-479, which allowed the deed to be changed from public use to the particular use of the childcare center. Donations by the community, totaling \$75,000, turned the building into a nursery, daycare, and afterschool care facility.

Additionally, the establishment of the daycare center provided for the creation of a playground that the center supports and opens for public use. To

be clear, the center and the playground are the sole reason this previously abandoned government land is being used by the community.

I have visited the Plains Area Daycare Center on many occasions, and I have seen the immeasurable investment this center is making in the community by providing high-quality childcare. Since opening in 1991, the center has always been at capacity and is the only facility of its kind in the community.

However, after 2 decades of consistent use, the facility is in desperate need of repairs. Unfortunately, because of the narrow way Public Law 101-479 was drafted and because of the terms of the deed, the daycare center has been unable to obtain a loan to complete much-needed renovations. To solve this problem, my legislation would remove the deed's use restrictions from the 1 acre of property on which the building resides.

While I would like to have seen the entire 3 acres released, this legislation is the result of a compromise that has been endorsed by the National Park Service and Rockingham County. By passing this legislation and allowing Rockingham County and, in turn, the Plains Area Daycare Center more authority over the land, we will ensure that more children and more of the community will be served.

Mr. Speaker, while my legislation today is simply a formality, it is of great importance to those being served by this daycare center in the community. For 25 years, the land has been deeded to Rockingham County, but with overbearing restrictions. Since it is clear the Federal Government no longer has a vested interest in the land, it is time to lift those restrictions to allow the Plains Area Daycare Center to reach its full potential.

Twenty years ago, Congress made its intention clear that a daycare facility was to have use of the property, and I am pleased to lead the charge in fixing the law.

Again, I thank Chairman BISHOP and his committee for bringing this bill before the House. I also thank my legislative assistant, Angela Inglett, for her hard work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 954 to simply remove the deed restrictions on 1 acre of land so that the necessary upgrades may be made to the childcare center and so that this community investment may continue.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 954.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERAGENCY TRANSFER OF LAND ALONG GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1397) to authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal land, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1397

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. INTERAGENCY TRANSFER OF LAND ALONG GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MAP.—The term “Map” means the map entitled “George Washington Memorial Parkway—Claude Moore Farm Proposed Boundary Adjustment”, numbered 850 130815, and dated February 2016.

(2) RESEARCH CENTER.—The term “Research Center” means the Turner-Fairbank Highway Research Center of the Federal Highway Administration.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION TRANSFER.—

(1) TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION.—

(A) GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY LAND.—Administrative jurisdiction over the approximately 0.342 acres of Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary within the boundary of the George Washington Memorial Parkway, as generally depicted as “B” on the Map, is transferred from the Secretary to the Secretary of Transportation.

(B) RESEARCH CENTER LAND.—Administrative jurisdiction over the approximately 0.479 acres of Federal land within the boundary of the Research Center land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Transportation adjacent to the boundary of the George Washington Memorial Parkway, as generally depicted as “A” on the Map, is transferred from the Secretary of Transportation to the Secretary.

(2) USE RESTRICTION.—The Secretary shall restrict the use of 0.139 acres of Federal land within the boundary of the George Washington Memorial Parkway immediately adjacent to part of the perimeter fence of the Research Center, generally depicted as “C” on the Map, by prohibiting the storage, construction, or installation of any item that may interfere with the access of the Research Center to the restricted land for security and maintenance purposes.

(3) REIMBURSEMENT OR CONSIDERATION.—The transfers of administrative jurisdiction under this subsection shall not be subject to reimbursement or consideration.

(4) COMPLIANCE WITH AGREEMENT.—

(A) AGREEMENT.—The National Park Service and the Federal Highway Administration shall comply with all terms and conditions of the agreement entered into by the parties on September 11, 2002, regarding the transfer of administrative jurisdiction, management, and maintenance of the land described in the agreement.

(B) ACCESS TO RESTRICTED LAND.—Subject to the terms of the agreement described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall allow the Research Center—

(1) to access the Federal land described in paragraph (1)(B) for purposes of transportation to and from the Research Center; and

(ii) to access the Federal land described in paragraphs (1)(B) and (2) for purposes of maintenance in accordance with National Park Service standards, including grass mowing, weed control, tree maintenance, fence maintenance, and maintenance of the visual appearance of the Federal land.

(c) MANAGEMENT OF TRANSFERRED LAND.—

(1) INTERIOR LAND.—The Federal land transferred to the Secretary under subsection (b)(1)(B) shall be—

(A) included in the boundary of the George Washington Memorial Parkway; and

(B) administered by the Secretary as part of the George Washington Memorial Parkway, subject to applicable laws (including regulations).

(2) TRANSPORTATION LAND.—The Federal land transferred to the Secretary of Transportation under subsection (b)(1)(A) shall be—

(A) included in the boundary of the Research Center land; and

(B) removed from the boundary of the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

(3) RESTRICTED-USE LAND.—The Federal land that the Secretary has designated for restricted use under subsection (b)(2) shall be maintained by the Research Center.

(d) MAP ON FILE.—The Map shall be available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

□ 1645

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1397, offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK), would authorize a small land exchange between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Transportation.

Specifically, the bill transfers administrative jurisdiction over approximately a third of an acre of Federal land within the boundary of the George Washington Memorial Parkway of the National Park Service to the Department of Transportation, and transfers from the Department of Transportation approximately a half an acre of Federal land within the boundary of the Turner-Fairbank Highway Research Center of the Federal Highway Administration.

The transfer centers on Colonial Farm Road, which provides public access to Claude Moore Colonial Farm and also serves as an entrance road to the Turner-Fairbank Highway Research Center and as a secondary entrance to the Central Intelligence Agency. The configuration of the property lines between the farm and the research center requires farm staff to

travel across research center property to access their facilities.

The three Federal agencies have discussed concerns over crossing property lines, the need to have uninterrupted access to the properties, and the need to improve security near perimeter fencing of the research center. The agencies have identified properties suitable for exchange on their boundaries which will provide public access to the farm while providing the means to improve security outside the fencing of the research center and the Central Intelligence Agency. Though the immediate security concerns have previously been addressed through a temporary agreement, legislation is needed to codify the land exchange.

I include in the RECORD an exchange of letters to Chairman BILL SHUSTER of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the responses. We thank them for agreeing to help expedite consideration of this bill today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and
Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On June 27, 2017, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered favorably reported without amendment H.R. 1397, to authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal land. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Natural Resources, with an additional referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I ask that you allow the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources to memorialize our understanding, as well as in the Congressional Record.

Thank you for your consideration of my request and for the extraordinary cooperation shown by you and your staff over matters of shared jurisdiction. I look forward to further opportunities to work with you this Congress.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BISHOP: Thank you for your letter concerning H.R. 1397, to authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal land. As noted, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure received an additional referral on this legislation.

In order to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 1397, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure agrees to forgo action on this bill. However, as you noted, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill would not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. Should a conference on the bill be necessary, I appreciate your agreement to support my request to have the Committee represented on the conference committee.

Thank you for your cooperation on this matter and for agreeing to place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the bill report and the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1397 authorizes the National Park Service and the Federal Highway Administration to comply with a longstanding agreement regarding two parcels of land near Claude Moore Colonial Farm in McLean, Virginia.

Specifically, the bill transfers a small parcel within the boundary of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Transportation. The bill also transfers a half acre within the Turner-Fairbank Highway Research Center from the Department of Transportation to the Department of the Interior.

Simply put, this bill permits a one-time land transfer that was agreed to 15 years ago. Ultimately, this will improve management efficiency and save taxpayer money.

The bill is noncontroversial and has been a longstanding legislative priority of the National Park Service. I commend the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK) for her bipartisanship, and I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK).

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 1397, which would authorize this Federal land exchange between the National Park Service and the Federal Highway Administration.

As has been discussed, at issue is the jurisdiction of an access road adjacent to the Claude Moore Colonial Farm, a privately funded living history museum which is part of the National Park Service and in my district in McLean, Virginia.

Claude Moore Farm is a wonderful way to experience what life was like on a small family farm for the average family in the late 1700s, not the plantations that we often see preserved, but a very small, average family farm.

Claude Moore Farm is tucked in right next to the CIA, as has been mentioned, and the jurisdiction of this particular access road off of George Washington Memorial Parkway has not been clear and has resulted in confusion and unnecessary security concerns.

Over the years, general use of this access road has set off security alarms at Langley. And this confusion has not only been difficult for security personnel; it has also cost taxpayer resources.

On September 11, 2002, the National Park Service and the Federal Highway Administration entered into an agreement under which the transfer of administrative jurisdiction, management, and maintenance of the lands in question were agreed upon. Since then, the two parties have been abiding by these rules.

What this agreement does now is make this permanent in a legislative fix. It is a commonsense, bipartisan bill. We worked on this with Senator WARNER also. Last year he was able to get it attached to the energy package, but that did not pass, so we now need this to move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this straightforward, non-controversial bill.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1397.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PASCUA YAQUI TRIBE LAND CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1404) to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Tucson Unified School District and to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1404

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pascua Yaqui Tribe Land Conveyance Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) **DISTRICT.**—The term “District” means the Tucson Unified School District No. 1, a school district recognized as such under the laws of the State of Arizona.

(2) **MAP.**—The term “Map” means the map titled “Pascua Yaqui Tribe Land Conveyance Act”, dated March 14, 2016, and on file and available for public inspection in the local office of the Bureau of Land Management.

(3) **RECREATION AND PUBLIC PURPOSES ACT.**—The term “Recreation and Public Purposes Act” means the Act of June 14, 1926 (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.).

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) **TRIBE.**—The term “Tribe” means the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, a federally recognized Indian tribe.

SEC. 3. LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST.

(a) **PARCEL A.**—Subject to subsection (b) and to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the approximately 39.65 acres of Federal lands generally depicted on the map as “Parcel A” are declared to be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Subsection (a) shall take effect on the day after the date on which the District relinquishes all right, title, and interest of the District in and to the approximately 39.65 acres of land described in subsection (a).

SEC. 4. LANDS TO BE CONVEYED TO THE DISTRICT.

(a) **PARCEL B.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights and payment to the United States of the fair market value, the United States shall convey to the District all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the approximately 13.24 acres of Federal lands generally depicted on the map as “Parcel B”.

(2) **DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.**—The fair market value of the property to be conveyed under paragraph (1) shall be determined by the Secretary in accordance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(3) **COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.**—As a condition of the conveyance under this subsection, all costs associated with the conveyance shall be paid by the District.

(b) **PARCEL C.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If, not later than 1 year after the completion of the appraisal required by paragraph (3), the District submits to the Secretary an offer to acquire the Federal reversionary interest in all of the approximately 27.5 acres of land conveyed to the District under Recreation and Public Purposes Act and generally depicted on the map as “Parcel C”, the Secretary shall convey to the District such reversionary interest in the lands covered by the offer. The Secretary shall complete the conveyance not later than 30 days after the date of the offer.

(2) **SURVEY.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the lands described in this subsection to determine the precise boundaries and acreage of the lands subject to the Federal reversionary interest.

(3) **APPRAISAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete an appraisal of the Federal reversionary interest in the lands identified by the survey required by paragraph (2). The appraisal shall be completed in accordance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(4) **CONSIDERATION.**—As consideration for the conveyance of the Federal reversionary interest under this subsection, the District shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the appraised value of the Federal interest, as determined under paragraph (3). The consideration shall be paid not later than 30 days after the date of the conveyance.

(5) **COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.**—As a condition of the conveyance under this subsection, all costs associated with the conveyance, including the cost of the survey required by paragraph (2) and the appraisal required by paragraph (3), shall be paid by the District.

SEC. 5. GAMING PROHIBITION.

The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities on lands taken into trust pursuant to this Act, either as a matter of claimed inherent authority, under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), or under regulations promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SEC. 6. WATER RIGHTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There shall be no Federal reserved right to surface water or groundwater for any land taken into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe under this Act.

(b) **STATE WATER RIGHTS.**—The Tribe retains any right or claim to water under State law for any land taken into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe under this Act.

(c) **FORFEITURE OR ABANDONMENT.**—Any water rights that are appurtenant to land taken into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe under this Act may not be forfeited or abandoned.

(d) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Nothing in this Act affects or modifies any right of the Tribe or any obligation of the United States under Public Law 95–375.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1404, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe Land Conveyance Act, sponsored by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the ranking member on the National Resources Committee.

H.R. 1404 would authorize a land exchange involving the Tribe, the Tucson Unified School District, and the Department of the Interior.

Under the bill, a 39.65-acre parcel of land currently held by the district shall be placed in trust for the benefit of the Tribe if the district relinquishes all right, title, and interest to it.

A 13.24-acre parcel of land shall be sold by the U.S. to the district at fair market value, and a Federal interest of

27.5 acres of land held by the district shall be cleared in exchange for the district paying the appraised value of the Federal interest. The Federal interest is a reversionary interest imposed on certain land patented to the district under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926.

All transfers under the bill are subject to valid existing rights. Gaming pursuant to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act would be prohibited on lands taken into trust under the bill.

This bill is substantively similar to the bill the House passed during the 114th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the sponsor. I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation represents the final part of a collaborative land agreement between the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, located in southern Arizona, and the Tucson Unified School District, TUSD.

H.R. 1404 will transfer a 40-acre parcel currently managed by TUSD under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act into a trust for the Tribe. Two additional parcels of land will be transferred to the TUSD, provided that the TUSD pays fair market value so that it may better plan for the future needs of the school district in the areas near the Tribe's reservation.

I want to commend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the ranking member and sponsor of the bill, not only for his leadership on the Natural Resources Committee, but for bringing this legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1404, as was stated by my two colleagues, is a culmination of a longstanding land agreement between Tucson Unified School District and the Pascua Yaqui Tribe. In the 113th Congress, we finalized part of that agreement with the passage and signing of H.R. 507, which conveyed the two 10-acre parcels.

Both of my colleagues have stated the purpose of the legislation, the need for the legislation. The passage of this bill will complete the second part of that agreement, and both parties involved, as well as the surrounding communities, all see mutual benefit in this.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the bill is acted upon positively, that it passes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman BISHOP for his cooperation in working with our staff to bring this to the floor today, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, briefly, the bill is identical to H.R. 2009, which passed in the 114th Congress by voice vote. That is why, as well as what we have heard today, I urge quick adoption of this legislation once again.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1541.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

—————

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN PROPERTY RELATED TO THE FORT SCOTT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1541) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property related to the Fort Scott National Historic Site in Fort Scott, Kansas, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1541

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION TO ACQUIRE LUNETTE BLAIR.

The Act entitled “An Act to authorize establishment of the Fort Scott National Historic Site, Kansas, and for other purposes.”, approved October 19, 1978 (Public Law 95-484) is amended—

(1) in the first section—

(A) by inserting “only” after “donation”; and

(B) by striking “: *Provided*, that the buildings so acquired shall not include the structure known as ‘Lunette Blair’”; and

(2) in section 2—

(A) by striking “When the site of” and inserting “(a) When the site of”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) The boundary of the Fort Scott National Historic Site established under subsection (a) is modified as generally depicted on the map referred to as ‘Fort Scott National Historic Site Proposed Boundary Modification’, numbered 471/80,057C, and dated February 2017.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1541, sponsored by the gentleman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), removes the statutory prohibition preventing the Secretary of the Interior from acquiring a structure known as the Lunette Blair blockhouse and including the structure in the boundary of the Fort Scott National Historic Site.

Congress initially deemed the Lunette Blair blockhouse anachronistic and excluded the structure from the boundaries of the Fort Scott National Historic Site. The National Park Service now wants to add the blockhouse to expand the interpretation of the site and to demonstrate its different roles throughout American history. The private citizens that currently maintain the blockhouse would like to donate the structure to the National Park Service.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support preservation of this unique piece of Kansas’ heritage, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1541 authorizes the National Park Service to expand the boundary of the Fort Scott National Historic Site in Fort Scott, Kansas.

□ 1700

Fort Scott was designated as a National Historic Landmark back in 1964. Eight years later, in 1972, Congress established the site as a unit of the National Park Service “to commemorate the significant role played by Fort Scott in the opening of the West, as well as the Civil War and strife in the State of Kansas that preceded it.”

The site is currently a modest 16 acres. The additions authorized by this bill will add approximately 3.8 acres to the park. The properties to be added include the only intact Civil War era building, Civil War entrenchments and fortifications, and home sites of the first African-American families who settled in the area after the war.

Preserving the story of freedom on the frontier is an important goal, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I note that the sponsor, Ms. JENKINS, was unable to be here to speak in support of her bill. She was unavoidably detained in her district due to a flight cancellation today. However, I have her statement in strong support of the measure. On her behalf, I urge adoption of the measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1541, legislation that would strike a prohibition in the Fort Scott National Historic Site’s enabling law that prohibited the

incorporation of the structure known as the Lunette Blair blockhouse into the site’s formation.

Fortunately, the blockhouse still sits right across the street from the historic site, where, under the future care of the National Park Service, it can remain on display in perpetuity without disrupting the grounds’ antebellum view shed, successfully linking the site’s frontier fort structures with the community’s Civil War legacy.

Located in the historic town of Fort Scott, Kansas, the Fort Scott National Historic Site preserves the important story of the original frontier fort’s role in nineteenth-century America. It serves as a physical snapshot of the pioneer days of westward migration of a young republic, from its initial construction 175 years ago, and portrays a figurative stepping-stone upon the prairie toward a transcontinental nation.

However, the story of the community of Fort Scott continues from that point on as the town grew around the shuttered fort of the same name. The community’s history itself invokes the violent struggles of the era we all know as Bleeding Kansas and the conflicts of the Civil War.

After the U.S. Army demobilized Fort Scott in 1853 following the collapse of a permanent Indian frontier, private residents purchased the last of its property; the buildings of the old fort became the new town. Soon after, Americans of opposing sentiments, abolitionists, free-staters, and Border Ruffians alike, settled the area throughout the rest of the decade in turmoil. While the territory of Kansas ultimately became the free state of Kansas on January 29, 1861, violent conflict soon engulfed the entire nation.

During the Civil War, the Union Army militarized the town of Fort Scott to store Union supplies and to deter Confederate invasions into Southeast Kansas. The Union Army constructed many fortifications in the surrounding area, including four garrisoned blockhouses, or “lunettes,” fortified structures with designated names, such as Fort Lincoln, Fort Insley, Fort Henning, and Fort Blair, in order to house soldiers and armaments while protecting the town’s approach.

While these structures successfully deterred such attacks, the U.S. War Department considered these four blockhouses as surplus property after the Civil War and sold them at auction to private individuals. The structure called Fort Blair, known locally today as Lunette Blair is the sole remaining Civil War blockhouse standing today.

Mr. Speaker, it is only through the diligent stewardship of the citizens of Fort Scott, Kansas, and their dedication to preserve the community’s heritage, that the Lunette Blair blockhouse still stands after all these years.

Members of the Fort Scott community support the donation of the blockhouse to the National Park Service and this proposal is in line with the sites’ overall mission: to tell the encompassing story of Fort Scott’s role in westward migration and to demonstrate the community’s contribution in preserving our Union during the Civil War.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1541.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN MUIR NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE EXPANSION ACT

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1719) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1719

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) *HISTORIC SITE.*—The term "Historic Site" means the John Muir National Historic Site in Martinez, California, established by Public Law 88-547 (78 Stat. 753).

(2) *MAP.*—The term "map" means the map entitled "John Muir National Historic Site Proposed Boundary Expansion", numbered 426/127150, and dated November 2014.

(3) *SECRETARY.*—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. JOHN MUIR NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE LAND ACQUISITION.

(a) *ACQUISITION.*—The Secretary may acquire by donation the approximately 44 acres of land and any interests in the land that is identified on the map.

(b) *BOUNDARY.*—On the acquisition of the land authorized under subsection (a), the Secretary shall adjust the boundaries of the Historic Site to include the acquired land.

(c) *ADMINISTRATION.*—The land and any interests in land acquired under subsection (a) shall be administered as part of the National Historic Site.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1719 would authorize the expansion of the John Muir National Historic Site by approximately 44 acres.

Located in the San Francisco Bay Area, in Martinez, California, this site preserves the 14-room Italianate Victorian mansion where John Muir lived, as well as a 325-acre tract of native oak woodlands and grasslands owned by the Muir family.

The additional proposed acreage in this bill is directly adjacent to the cur-

rent site and will allow for better public access to trails in the area. This acreage will be donated to the National Park Service and will not be acquired with any Federal dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1719 authorizes the National Park Service to expand the boundary of the John Muir National Historic Site and acquire 44 acres of land from the Muir Heritage Land Trust. The donation will expand the site and help carry on Muir's important legacy of conservation and environmental stewardship.

John Muir is one of our Nation's most respected and revered ecologists. His writings have inspired millions, and his activism and advocacy led to the establishment of some of our first and most iconic national parks.

From the moment he set foot in Yosemite Valley, John Muir was consumed with its natural wonder and beauty. He became Yosemite's most vocal champion, but he didn't spend his whole life there.

From 1890 until his death in 1914, Muir lived on a farm not far from San Francisco. It was from this corner of the bay area that Muir cofounded the Sierra Club and helped lay the groundwork for a century of conservation.

John Muir's tireless advocacy led to the creation of Yosemite and Sequoia National Parks, and his spirit and enduring legacy led to the protection of much more.

Passage of H.R. 1719 will contribute to John Muir's legacy and it will help to protect and conserve the place where he found solace and inspiration in his later years.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the bill's sponsor, Representative DESAULNIER from California, and I urge swift passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 1719, the John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act. This bipartisan legislation will expand the Martinez, California, historic site in my district that celebrates the life and legacy of John Muir.

Muir was a lifelong conservationist, a leading advocate of the National Park Service, and a cofounder of the Sierra Club. He worked to establish and protect national parks, including Yosemite, Sequoia, Grand Canyon, and Mount Rainier.

The John Muir National Historic Site, which includes the home where he

lived, covers 330 acres of Contra Costa County where Muir championed the revolutionary idea that wild spaces should be set aside for all to enjoy.

This bill would make it possible for the National Park Service to accept a donation of 44 acres of land from the John Muir Land Trust, improving access to the park and its scenic trails, including those on Mount Wanda, named after Muir's eldest daughter.

The trail systems are accessible for hikers, bikers, and equestrians, including critical connections to the 550-mile Bay Area Ridge Trail and to nearby protected lands along the Franklin Ridge corridor.

As John Muir once said, "everybody needs beauty, as well as bread, places to play in . . . where nature may heal and cheer and give strength to body and soul alike."

Mr. Speaker, I thank my predecessor, Congressman George Miller, who championed this bill. I also thank the Natural Resources Committee chair, Chairman BISHOP; Ranking Member GRIJALVA; the subcommittee chairman, Mr. MCCLINTOCK from California; and subcommittee ranking member, Ms. HANABUSA for their leadership in bringing H.R. 1719 to the floor today.

I am grateful for the support of 21 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle who cosponsored this legislation, and to Senator KAMALA HARRIS for leading the bill's counterpart in the U.S. Senate.

I also thank the John Muir Land Trust for its hard work and dedication preserving and protecting this valuable parkland and shoreline in Contra Costa County for future generations.

This legislation puts a fitting emphasis on the National Park Service's centennial celebrations, helping to preserve the trails and lands that surround the longtime home of the man known as the "father" of the U.S. National Park Service.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bipartisan legislation, the John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Natural Resources, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1719, the "John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act," authorizing the Department of the Interior to acquire an additional 44 acres of land to expand the John Muir National Historic Site, which currently stretches across 330 acres in the East Bay of San Francisco and includes the home where legendary naturalist John Muir lived until he died in 1914.

The John Muir National Historic Site, established by Congress in 1964, is located in Martinez, California and honor one of the nation's foremost conservationists, whom historians refer to as the "Father of the National Park Service."

The historic site preserves the 14-room Italianate Victorian mansion where the naturalist and writer John Muir lived, as well as a

nearby 325 acre tract of native oak woodlands and grasslands historically owned by the Muir family.

H.R. 1719 authorizes the Department of the Interior to acquire by donation approximately 44 acres to expand the boundary of John Muir National Historic Site.

The acreage to be acquired is directly continuous with Mount Wanda and will allow for better public access to trails.

In the 114th Congress, H.R. 1289, a bill identical to H.R. 1719, passed the House by voice vote.

Additionally, a similar bill, H.R. 5699, was introduced in the 113th Congress by former Congressman George Miller, and passed the House by a vote of 361–39.

Companion legislation, S. 729, has been introduced in the Senate by Senator KAMALA HARRIS of California.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1719 is a fitting tribute to one of America's greatest citizen activists, the co-founder of the Sierra Club, and a central actor in the successful effort to establish Yosemite National Park.

I urge all Members to join me in voting for H.R. 1719.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1719, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CLEAR CREEK NATIONAL RECREATION AREA AND CONSERVATION ACT

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1913) to establish the Clear Creek National Recreation Area in San Benito and Fresno Counties, California, to designate the Joaquin Rocks Wilderness in such counties, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1913

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Clear Creek National Recreation Area and Conservation Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The term “management plan” means the Plan for the Recreation Area prepared under section 4(c).

(2) **RECREATION AREA.**—The term “Recreation Area” means the Clear Creek National Recreation Area.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of California.

(5) **OFF HIGHWAY VEHICLE.**—The term “off highway vehicle” means any motorized vehicle designed for or capable of cross-country travel on or immediately over land, water, snow, or other natural terrain and not intended for use on public roads.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF CLEAR CREEK NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—To promote environmentally responsible off highway vehicle recreation, the area generally depicted as “Proposed Clear Creek National Recreation Area” on the map titled “Proposed Clear Creek National Recreation Area” and dated February 14, 2017, is established as the “Clear Creek National Recreation Area”, to be managed by the Secretary.

(b) **OTHER PURPOSES.**—The Recreation Area shall also support other public recreational uses, such as hunting, hiking, and rock and gem collecting.

(c) **MAP ON FILE.**—Copies of the map referred to in subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in—

(1) the Office of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management; and

(2) the appropriate office of the Bureau of Land Management in California.

SEC. 4. MANAGEMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage the Recreation Area to further the purposes described in section 3(a), in accordance with—

(1) this Act;

(2) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(3) any other applicable law.

(b) **USES.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) prioritize environmentally responsible off highway vehicle recreation and also facilitate hunting, hiking, gem collecting, and the use of motorized vehicles, mountain bikes, and horses in accordance with the management plan described in subsection (c);

(2) issue special recreation permits for motorized and non-motorized events; and

(3) reopen the Clear Creek Management Area to the uses described in this subsection as soon as practicable following the enactment of this Act and in accordance with the management guidelines outlined in this Act and other applicable law.

(c) **INTERIM MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The Secretary shall use the 2006 Clear Creek Management Area Resource Management Plan Amendment and Route Designation Record of Decision as modified by this Act or the Secretary to incorporate natural resource protection information not available in 2006, as the basis of an interim management plan to govern off highway vehicle recreation within the Recreation Area pending the completion of the long-term management plan required in subsection (d).

(d) **PERMANENT MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall create a comprehensive management plan for the Clear Creek Recreation Area that—

(1) shall describe the appropriate uses and management of the Recreation Area in accordance with this Act;

(2) shall be prepared in consultation with—
(A) appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies (including San Benito, Monterey, and Fresno Counties);

(B) adjacent land owners;

(C) other stakeholders (including conservation and recreational organizations); and

(D) holders of any easements, rights-of-way, and other valid rights in the Recreation Area;

(3) shall include a hazards education program to inform people entering the Recreation Area of the asbestos related risks associated with various activities within the

Recreation Area, including off-highway vehicle recreation;

(4) shall include a user fee program for motorized vehicle use within the Recreational Area and guidelines for the use of the funds collected for the management and improvement of the Recreation Area;

(5) shall designate as many previously used trails, roads, and other areas for off highway vehicle recreation as feasible in accordance with this in order to provide a substantially similar recreational experience, except that nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as precluding the Secretary from closing any area, trail, or route from use for the purposes of public safety or resource protection;

(6) may incorporate any appropriate decisions, as determined by the Secretary, in accordance with this Act, that are contained in any management or activity plan for the area completed before the date of the enactment of this Act;

(7) may incorporate appropriate wildlife habitat management plans or other plans prepared for the land within or adjacent to the Recreation Area before the date of the enactment of this Act, in accordance with this Act;

(8) may use information developed under any studies of land within or adjacent to the Recreation Area carried out before the date of enactment of this Act; and

(9) may include cooperative agreements with State or local government agencies to manage all or a portion of the recreational activities within the Recreation Area in accordance with an approved management plan and the requirements of this Act.

(e) **ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may acquire land adjacent to the National Recreation Area by purchase from willing sellers, donation, or exchange.

(2) **MANAGEMENT.**—Any land acquired under paragraph (1) shall be managed in accordance with—

(A) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(B) this Act; and

(C) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(3) **IMPROVED ACCESS.**—The Secretary may acquire by purchase from willing sellers, donation, exchange, or easement, land, or interest in land to improve public safety in providing access to the Recreation Area.

(f) **PRIVATE PROPERTY.**—

(1) **ACCESS TO PRIVATE PROPERTY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall provide landowners adequate access to inholdings within the Recreation Area.

(B) **INHOLDINGS.**—For access purposes, private land adjacent to the Recreation Area to which there is no other practicable access except through the Recreation Area shall be managed as an inholding.

(2) **USE OF PRIVATE PROPERTY.**—Nothing in this Act affects the ownership, management, or other rights relating to any non-Federal land (including any interest in any non-Federal land).

(3) **BUFFER ZONES.**—Nothing in this Act creates a protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Recreation Area.

(4) **VALID RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this Act affects any easements, rights-of-way, and other valid rights in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(g) **WATER RIGHT EXCLUSION.**—Nothing in this Act—

(1) shall constitute or be construed to constitute either an express or implied reservation by the United States of any water or water rights with respect to the Recreation Area; or

(2) shall affect any water rights existing on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(h) HUNTING AND FISHING.—Nothing in this Act—

(1) limits hunting or fishing; or
 (2) affects the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of the State to manage, control, or regulate fish and resident wildlife under State law (including regulations), including the regulation of hunting or fishing on public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

(i) MOTORIZED VEHICLES.—Except in cases in which motorized vehicles are needed for administrative purposes or to respond to an emergency, the use of motorized vehicles on public land in the Recreation Area shall be permitted only on roads, trails, and areas designated by the management plan for the use by motorized vehicles.

(j) GRAZING.—In the Recreation Area, the grazing of livestock in areas in which grazing is allowed as of the date of the enactment of this Act shall be allowed to continue, consistent with—

(1) this Act;
 (2) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and
 (3) any regulations promulgated by the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

(k) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, all Federal land within the Recreation Area is withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;
 (2) location, entry, and patenting under the mining laws; and
 (3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(l) FEES.—Amounts received by the Secretary under the fee structure required by subsection (d)(4) shall be—

(1) deposited in a special account in the Treasury of the United States; and
 (2) made available until expended to the Secretary for use in the Recreation Area.

(m) RISK STANDARD.—The National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (section 300 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations), published pursuant to section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9605), shall not apply to the Secretary's management of asbestos exposure risks faced by the public when recreating within the Clear Creek Recreation Area described in section 3(b).

SEC. 5. JOAQUIN ROCKS WILDERNESS.

In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the approximately 21,000 acres of Federal lands located in Fresno County and San Benito County, California, and generally depicted on a map entitled "Proposed Joaquin Rocks Wilderness" and dated February 14, 2017, is designated as wilderness and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System and shall be known as the "Joaquin Rocks Wilderness".

SEC. 6. RELEASE OF SAN BENITO MOUNTAIN WILDERNESS STUDY AREA.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that, for the purposes of section 603 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782), the San Benito Mountain wilderness study area has been adequately studied for wilderness designation.

(b) RELEASE.—The San Benito Mountain wilderness study area is no longer subject to section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)).

SEC. 7. CLARIFICATION REGARDING FUNDING.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and the gentleman

from California (Mr. PANETTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1913, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA), is a bipartisan bill that reopens public access and facilitates recreational activities in central California. The bill designates 63,000 acres as the Clear Creek National Recreation Area, 21,000 acres as the Joaquin Rocks Wilderness, and releases 1,500 acres of wilderness study area.

Once considered a world class off-highway vehicle, or OHV, recreation designation, the Clear Creek area has been closed to the public for nearly a decade due to concerns from the EPA about naturally occurring asbestos. However, after commissioning a study of the area, the State of California's Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division found a minimal health risk to OHV users from exposure to naturally occurring asbestos. Despite these findings and appeals from local communities and OHV users, the Bureau of Land Management has not reopened the area to the public or for OHV use.

This bill remedies the situation by reopening and redesignating the area as the Clear Creek National Recreation Area and including special provisions to prioritize and facilitate long-term, sustainable off-highway vehicle access and recreation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1913 establishes the Clear Creek National Recreation Area and the Joaquin Rocks Wilderness Area on land administered by the Bureau of Land Management in the central coast region of California. From hiking and hunting to off-highway vehicle use, those designations will improve and enhance access for a variety of recreational activities, while ensuring that ecologically sensitive and unique areas are managed in a way that supports their lasting and permanent protection.

In addition to the many ecological benefits they provide, including clean air and clean water, wilderness areas throughout the country play a large role in supporting the approximately \$646 billion per year outdoor recreation economy, so I am pleased that we are advancing this bill to add 21,000 acres of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

This bill has strong local support from San Benito County government officials and a number of off-highway vehicle and wilderness groups. These advocates understand that Clear Creek is important to the economy, and they have fond memories of the recreational opportunities when they were younger.

I have received numerous support comments from my constituents, the off-highway vehicle community, and other California residents about the importance of Clear Creek to their family and how the closure has impacted them. It is time to honor the desire of my constituents in California's 20th Congressional District and pass this bill once again.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters in support of the bill.

SAN BENITO COUNTY,
 Hollister, CA, June 1, 2017.

Re Letter in Support of H.R. 1913.

Hon. JIMMY PANETTA,
 House of Representatives,
 Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PANETTA: I would like to express my support of proposed legislation H.R. 1913. On at least three previous occasions, the San Benito County Board of Supervisors has formally expressed their support of this proposed measure in the form of H.R. 1776 as submitted by then-Congressman Sam Farr.

As background, the Serpentine Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) of the Clear Creek Management Area (CCMA) was closed in 2008 based on a study by the EPA which concluded that naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) posed a public health risk. However, in 2010, the Off Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation (OHMVR) Division of the State of California Department of Parks and Recreation Commissioned an independent OHV-specific risk assessment of NOA exposure within the Serpentine ACEC of the CCMA.

This report, completed by the International Environmental Research Foundation (IERF), concluded that management and operation strategies could be employed to allow for off-highway vehicle (OHV) recreation in the CCMA without exposing the public to higher than acceptable levels of NOA and without presenting a serious risk to human health. Specifically, the risk of OHV usage five days per year, for eight hours on each of those days, was equated to being similar to the lifetime risk of smoking less than one cigarette one the same one year period, and the report noted that other recreational activities, such as swimming, hiking and snow skiing, are over 100 times more dangerous.

In light of this report which directly contradicts the conclusions of the EPA study and undermines the necessity of BLM actions taken since 2008 in reliance of that study, it would appear that closure of the ACEC is not scientifically warranted, and especially not during winter months when dust from OHV activity is greatly reduced.

Therefore, the County supports opening the area to OHV users once again and allowing the public access to this natural area which is easily accessible to the urban residents in the San Jose/San Francisco metropolitan areas. H.R. 1913, which would establish the Clear Creek National Recreation Area in San Benito and Fresno Counties, is essential to enhancing public access to natural and scenic areas within our State.

The lack of evidence of a serious health risk is reinforced by the fact that there is

the lack of any documented case of any person, whether recreational, visitor or governmental employee, injured by NOA within the ACEC despite the use of the area for decades. Therefore, the activities taken to close the area are especially troubling considering the effect of the closure on the public generally, as well as the local economy.

Access to recreational areas within San Benito County, including the CCMA, provides a necessary and substantial component to the local economy which has been drastically affected by the recent economic climate. The BLM's past decision to close the Clear Creek area has already seriously affected San Benito County's economic vitality. The County could understand such action if there was truly a serious health risk presented by use of the CCMA, but there is no generally accepted scientific evidence, especially during wetter winter months.

The Clear Creek Management Area was among the five most popular areas cited by California off-highway-vehicle (OHV) users in a 1990 study conducted by the California Department of Parks and Recreation. Many of these users were residents of the San Jose and San Francisco Bay. In 2003 and 2004, there were an estimated 50,000 visitors to the CCMA, largely attributable to allowed OHV usage.

In conclusion, the Board of Supervisors supports the proposed legislation, as well as designation of the Clear Creek Management Area as a National Recreation Area, designation of OHV recreation as a "prescribed use" within the National Recreation Area, and providing that the management plan of the Clear Creek National Recreation Area, including OHV routes, open areas, number of permitted OHV events and other recreational activities should be as set forth in the 2005 Clear Creek Travel Management Plan.

Thank you for your consideration of this letter.

Respectfully,

JERRY MUENZER,
Supervisor District 4,
Board of Supervisors.

CALIFORNIA WILDERNESS PROJECT,
Cottonwood, CA, April 20, 2017.

Hon. JIMMY PANETTA,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PANETTA: We greatly appreciate your sponsorship of H.R. 1913, the Clear Creek National Recreation Area and Conservation Act. The legislation will permanently protect 21,000 acres of BLM land in Fresno and San Benito counties by its inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

The proposed Joaquin Rocks Wilderness follows the steep northern slope of Joaquin Ridge which climbs high above the floor of the western San Joaquin Valley.

Rising up over 4,000 feet from the valley floor, the striking Joaquin Rocks are the centerpiece of this remote area. These three scenic 250' tall monoliths are the eroded remnants of an ancient vaqueros sandstone formation.

The Joaquin Rocks are named for the legendary Joaquin Murieta, believed by some to be a heroic figure early California and an outlaw by others. The Joaquin Rocks are said to have provided a secluded hiding place for him and his band place during the 1850s. The area also shows archeological evidence of past Native American occupation.

The rugged area features deep canyons where oak woodlands cloak the numerous spur ridges that descend to the valley. Vegetation in the area includes, blue oak, California juniper, grey pine, chaparral, and native grasslands. Due to the cooler climate provided by its elevation, the area provides outstanding displays of native wildflowers well into summer.

The steep cliffs of the Joaquin Rocks—and the numerous other towering sandstone formations found throughout the area—are host to numerous falcons, hawks and owls. They could also provide potential nesting habitat for the California condor which has been re-introduced into the nearby Gavilan Range. One of the peaks of the Joaquin Rocks—La Centinela—hosts a vernal pool that supports fairy and tadpole shrimp.

The Joaquin Rocks proposed wilderness represents a unique opportunity to preserve one of central California's most outstanding natural landscapes and we sincerely appreciate Mr. Panetta's efforts to protect it for future generations.

Best Regards,

GORDON JOHNSON,
Director.

APRIL 10, 2017.

Hon. JIMMY PANETTA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PANETTA: As representatives of national motorized recreation organizations we write in support of the "Clear Creek National Recreation Area and Conservation Act" (H.R. 1913). This legislation would designate 75,000 acres of Federal land in San Benito and Fresno Counties in California as the Clear Creek National Recreation Area (NRA) and would ensure access for the responsible use of off-highway vehicles (OHVs) in the area into the future.

Clear Creek was closed in 2008 based on a questionable safety rationale related to exposure to asbestos. Subsequently the California Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Commission commissioned an independent risk assessment study which concluded that management and operational strategies could be effectively employed in the area to allow OHV use without exposing the public to unacceptable risks. H.R. 1913 would guarantee that moving forward, the area will be managed in such a way as to provide for all sorts of legitimate and responsible recreation, while also providing for the safety of all of the area's visitors.

Our support for H.R. 1913 is possible because of the endorsement of the bill from a broad array of local OHV organizations, businesses and enthusiasts. This local support is warranted not only because the legislation would reopen the popular OHV area, but because a diverse group of constituencies worked together on the bill.

We thank you for your statement upon introduction which makes it clear that you recognize the importance of multiple uses on public lands—"This bipartisan bill not only bolsters our area's conservation efforts, it also promotes recreation and tourism in our region. When this bill passes, locals and visitors will no longer be restricted from enjoying all that Clear Creek Management Area has to offer." We applaud this approach and hope that other Members of Congress will look to H.R. 1913 as a model for how to garner support for land use legislation.

Thank you for introducing this important bill. We look forward to working with you as it moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

Larry Smith, Executive Director, Americans for Responsible Recreational Access;

Nicole Nicholas Gilles, Executive Director, American Sand Association;

Don Amador, Western Representative, BlueRibbon Coalition, Inc.;

Duane Taylor, Director, Federal Affairs, Motorcycle Industry Council;

Russ Ehnes, Executive Director, National Off-Highway Vehicle Conservation Council;

Tom Yager, Vice President, Recreational Off-Highway Vehicle Association;

Stuart D. Gosswein, Sr. Director, Federal Government Affairs, Specialty Equipment Market Association;
Kathy Van Kleeck, Senior Vice President, Government Relations, Specialty Vehicle Institute of America;
Steve Egbert, Vice President, United Four Wheel Drive Associations, Inc.

CALIFORNIA WILDERNESS
COALITION,
Anderson, CA, May 19, 2017.

Subject: Support for H.R. 1913, the Clear Creek National Recreation Area and Conservation Act

Hon. JIMMY PANETTA,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PANETTA: We are pleased to offer our support for H.R. 1913, the Clear Creek National Recreation Area and Conservation Act. We strongly support the designation of the proposed 21,000-acre Joaquin Rocks Wilderness and the protection of over 31 miles of streams as wild and scenic rivers. We believe that the bill strikes a reasonable balance between environmental protection, off-road vehicle recreation, public safety and other considerations in the Clear Creek-Joaquin Rocks area.

Joaquin Rocks is one of the dramatic scenic features in the region, with its three prominent pinnacles of rock standing like sentinels above the San Joaquin Valley. Its oak woodlands, grasslands and other plant communities provide important habitat for sensitive plant and wildlife species. Joaquin Rocks also has important historical values as, among other things, the former hideout of the notorious outlaw Joaquin Murrieta.

Thank you for introducing and working to advance the legislation. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can assist you in this or any other public lands-related matter.

Sincerely,

RYAN HENSON,
Senior Policy Director.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill, and I thank Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA for their leadership, their work, and assistance in getting this bill to the floor of the House of Representatives. I also thank Representatives DAVID VALADAO, JEFF DENHAM, and PAUL COOK, as well as my predecessor, Representative Sam Farr, and our staffs for their work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge quick adoption of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend for introducing this legislation, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1913.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WESTERN OREGON TRIBAL
FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1306) to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1306

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

**TITLE I—COW CREEK UMPQUA LAND
CONVEYANCE**

Sec. 101. Definitions.

Sec. 102. Land to be held in trust.

Sec. 103. Map and legal description.

Sec. 104. Administration.

Sec. 105. Land reclassification.

**TITLE II—OREGON COASTAL LAND
CONVEYANCE**

Sec. 201. Definitions.

Sec. 202. Land to be held in trust.

Sec. 203. Map and legal description.

Sec. 204. Administration.

Sec. 205. Land reclassification.

**TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO COQUILLE
RESTORATION ACT**

Sec. 301. Amendments to Coquille Restoration Act.

**TITLE I—COW CREEK UMPQUA LAND
CONVEYANCE**

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **COUNCIL CREEK LAND.**—The term “Council Creek land” means the approximately 17,519 acres of land, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Canyon Mountain Land Conveyance” and dated May 24, 2016.

(2) **TRIBE.**—The term “Tribe” means the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 102. LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, including rights-of-way, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Council Creek land, including any improvements located on the land, appurtenances to the land, and minerals on or in the land, including oil and gas, shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) **SURVEY.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Subsection (a) shall take effect on the day after the date on which the Secretary records the agreement entered into under section 104(d)(1).

SEC. 103. MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal description of the Council Creek land with—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) **FORCE AND EFFECT.**—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall

have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(c) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Secretary.

SEC. 104. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Unless expressly provided in this title, nothing in this title affects any right or claim of the Tribe existing on the date of enactment of this Act to any land or interest in land.

(b) **PROHIBITIONS.**—

(1) **EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.**—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Council Creek land.

(2) **NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.**—Any real property taken into trust under section 102 shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under Public Law 100–497 (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(c) **FOREST MANAGEMENT.**—Any forest management activity that is carried out on the Council Creek land shall be managed in accordance with all applicable Federal laws.

(d) **AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACCESS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall seek to enter into an agreement with the Tribe that secures existing administrative access by the Secretary to the Council Creek land.

(2) **RECIPROCAL RIGHT-OF-WAY AGREEMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—On the date on which the agreement is entered into under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide to the Tribe all reciprocal right-of-way agreements to the Council Creek land in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) **CONTINUED ACCESS.**—Beginning on the date on which the Council Creek land is taken into trust under section 102, the Tribe shall continue the access provided by the agreements referred to in subparagraph (A) in perpetuity.

(e) **LAND USE PLANNING REQUIREMENTS.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), once the Council Creek land is taken into trust under section 102, the Council Creek land shall not be subject to the land use planning requirements of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) or the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.).

SEC. 105. LAND RECLASSIFICATION.

(a) **IDENTIFICATION OF OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LAND.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary shall identify any Oregon and California Railroad grant land that is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe under section 102.

(b) **IDENTIFICATION OF PUBLIC DOMAIN LAND.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall identify public domain land in the State of Oregon that—

(1) is approximately equal in acreage and condition as the Oregon and California Railroad grant land identified under subsection (a); and

(2) is located within the 18 western Oregon and California Railroad grant land counties (other than Klamath County, Oregon).

(c) **MAPS.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and publish in the Federal Register one or more maps depicting the land identified in subsections (a) and (b).

(d) **RECLASSIFICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—After providing an opportunity for public comment, the Secretary shall reclassify the land identified in subsection (b) as Oregon and California Railroad grant land.

(2) **APPLICABILITY.**—The Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.), shall apply to land reclassified as Oregon and California Railroad grant land under paragraph (1).

**TITLE II—OREGON COASTAL LAND
CONVEYANCE**

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **CONFEDERATED TRIBES.**—The term “Confederated Tribes” means the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians.

(2) **OREGON COASTAL LAND.**—The term “Oregon Coastal land” means the approximately 14,742 acres of land, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Oregon Coastal Land Conveyance” and dated July 11, 2016.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 202. LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, including rights-of-way, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Oregon Coastal land, including any improvements located on the land, appurtenances to the land, and minerals on or in the land, including oil and gas, shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Confederated Tribes; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Confederated Tribes.

(b) **SURVEY.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Subsection (a) shall take effect on the day after the date on which the Secretary records the agreement entered into under section 204(d)(1).

SEC. 203. MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal description of the Oregon Coastal land with—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) **FORCE AND EFFECT.**—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(c) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Secretary.

SEC. 204. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Unless expressly provided in this title, nothing in this title affects any right or claim of the Confederated Tribes existing on the date of enactment of this Act to any land or interest in land.

(b) **PROHIBITIONS.**—

(1) **EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.**—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Oregon Coastal land taken into trust under section 202.

(2) **NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.**—Any real property taken into trust under section 202 shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under Public Law 100–497 (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(c) **FOREST MANAGEMENT.**—Any forest management activity that is carried out on the

Oregon Coastal land shall be managed in accordance with all applicable Federal laws.

(d) AGREEMENTS.—

(1) MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACCESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall seek to enter into an agreement with the Confederated Tribes that secures existing administrative access by the Secretary to the Oregon Coastal land and that provides for—

(A) access for certain activities, including—

- (i) forest management;
- (ii) timber and rock haul;
- (iii) road maintenance;
- (iv) wildland fire protection and management;
- (v) cadastral surveys;
- (vi) wildlife, cultural, and other surveys; and
- (vii) law enforcement activities;

(B) the management of the Oregon Coastal land that is acquired or developed under chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, consistent with section 200305(f)(3) of that title; and

(C) the terms of public vehicular transit across the Oregon Coastal land to and from the Hult Log Storage Reservoir located in T. 15 S., R. 7 W., as generally depicted on the map described in section 201(2), subject to the requirement that if the Bureau of Land Management discontinues maintenance of the public recreation site known as “Hult Reservoir”, the terms of any agreement in effect on that date that provides for public vehicular transit to and from the Hult Log Storage Reservoir shall be void.

(2) RECIPROCAL RIGHT-OF-WAY AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—On the date on which the agreement is entered into under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide to the Confederated Tribes all reciprocal right-of-way agreements to the Oregon Coastal land in existence on the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) CONTINUED ACCESS.—Beginning on the date on which the Oregon Coastal land is taken into trust under section 202, the Confederated Tribes shall continue the access provided by the reciprocal right-of-way agreements referred to in subparagraph (A) in perpetuity.

(e) LAND USE PLANNING REQUIREMENTS.—Except as provided in subsection (c), once the Oregon Coastal land is taken into trust under section 202, the Oregon Coastal land shall not be subject to the land use planning requirements of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) or the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.).

SEC. 205. LAND RECLASSIFICATION.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LAND.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary shall identify any Oregon and California Railroad grant land that is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Confederated Tribes under section 202.

(b) IDENTIFICATION OF PUBLIC DOMAIN LAND.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall identify public domain land in the State of Oregon that—

(1) is approximately equal in acreage and condition as the Oregon and California Railroad grant land identified under subsection (a); and

(2) is located within the 18 western Oregon and California Railroad grant land counties (other than Klamath County, Oregon).

(c) MAPS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and publish in the

Federal Register one or more maps depicting the land identified in subsections (a) and (b).

(d) RECLASSIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After providing an opportunity for public comment, the Secretary shall reclassify the land identified in subsection (b) as Oregon and California Railroad grant land.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.), shall apply to land reclassified as Oregon and California Railroad grant land under paragraph (1).

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO COQUILLE RESTORATION ACT

SEC. 301. AMENDMENTS TO COQUILLE RESTORATION ACT.

Section 5(d) of the Coquille Restoration Act (Public Law 101-42; 103 Stat. 92, 110 Stat. 3009-537) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

“(5) MANAGEMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, shall manage the Coquille Forest in accordance with the laws pertaining to the management of Indian trust land.

“(B) ADMINISTRATION.—

“(i) UNPROCESSED LOGS.—Unprocessed logs harvested from the Coquille Forest shall be subject to the same Federal statutory restrictions on export to foreign nations that apply to unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land.

“(ii) SALES OF TIMBER.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all sales of timber from land subject to this subsection shall be advertised, offered, and awarded according to competitive bidding practices, with sales being awarded to the highest responsible bidder.”;

(2) by striking paragraph (9); and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (10) through (12) as paragraphs (9) through (11), respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to acknowledge the gentlemen from Oregon, Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. WALDEN, for their hard work on this important piece of legislation, which will benefit several Indian Tribes in the State of Oregon.

□ 1715

H.R. 1306 benefits three recognized Tribes in western Oregon by conveying publicly-owned forestlands to two of them, and to improve the management of forestlands currently held in trust for a third Tribe.

Various iterations of H.R. 1306 have been considered multiple times in pre-

vious Congresses, and nearly identical bills benefiting some or all of these Tribes were passed by the House in the 113th and 114th Congresses.

Title I of H.R. 1306 would place title to approximately 17,519 acres of public land in Oregon in trust for the benefit of the Cow Creek Umpqua Tribe. Lands to be held in trust under this section are depicted on a specific map, and the conveyance of the land in trust shall be subject to valid existing rights.

A substantial amount of the public land placed in trust for the Tribe is currently part of the Oregon and California railroad land grant, managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

Under title I, the Secretary is required to reclassify an equal acreage of public domain land located in the vicinity of the land given to the Tribe, as O&C land.

Land placed in trust by the Tribe under title I may not be used for gambling under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, and timber harvested from such land shall be subject to Federal law restricting the export of unprocessed logs.

Title II of the bill would provide that seven tracts of land currently managed by the Bureau of Land Management, totaling 14,742 acres, be held in trust for the benefit of the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians.

The parcels so transferred are located in western Oregon's Coos, Douglas, Benton, and Lane Counties, and include tracts such as the Coos Head, the Talbot Allotment, and the Umpqua Eden parcels, which are of particular cultural significance to the Tribes, as well as areas which are managed for timber production.

Title III would correct a situation with respect to the management of the Coquille Tribal Forest in Oregon. This forest has been regulated as part of the Northwest Forest Plan, which is inconsistent with the management of other tribally-managed forests in the United States. Under this title, the Coquille Tribe would manage its forest under the National Indian Forest Resources Management Act. This will improve the Tribe's ability to manage its timber resources.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1306 is a culmination of years of work to address the wrongs of the past. The termination era in Federal Indian policy is one of the darkest chapters in American history.

In Oregon, all but one of the Tribes lost their Federal recognition. Fortunately, the Federal Government eventually saw the error of their ways and restored the Tribes, but they were now left with nonexistent or inadequate land bases.

H.R. 1306, the Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act, will go a long way in

helping reestablish, long-promised land bases for the Oregon Tribes, while also giving them the ability to effectively manage their land on their own terms.

I want to thank our colleagues from Oregon, Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. WALDEN, for listening to the needs of the Oregon Tribal people and continuing to push this bipartisan legislation.

The previous version of this bill passed the House by voice vote last Congress, and I now urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, due to flight delays, I was unable to speak on the floor in support of my legislation.

The Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act is a bipartisan, no-cost, common sense bill that will go a long way to helping resolve some of the problems the Federal government and its haphazard policy shifts have created for three western Oregon tribes.

The bill provides fairness for the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw, the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, and the Coquille Indian Tribe.

Provisions of this bill were passed by voice vote in both the 113th and 114th Congresses. I hope this Congress it can finally become law. The tribes have waited entirely too long to receive the fairness owed to them.

For over a hundred years federal policies have unfairly disadvantaged Indian tribes in Western Oregon. After signing many treaties with the Tribes, the United States removed them from their original homelands and put them on only two reservations—established to house potentially more than 60 tribal governments.

In 1954, Congress made things even worse. All tribes west of the Cascades lost federal recognition when the Western Oregon Termination Act became law.

Scholars called it The Termination Era, and it was terrible federal Indian policy. It was so bad, that it was formally rebuked by Congress less than 30 years later.

In the 1970's, Congress began the process of restoring the Western Oregon tribes to federal recognition and cleaning up the mess and injustice the United States had made.

In fact, I began my Congressional career as the original sponsor of the Coquille Restoration Act, now law, which restored one of Oregon's terminated tribes.

Yet even today, it remains difficult for these tribes to function as the sovereign nations they are and to govern themselves effectively.

Unlike many tribes, the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Tribe, as well as the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, are deprived of any land held in trust.

Unlike any other tribe in the United States, the Coquille Indian Tribe must function under a legal anomaly with regard to managing its forest.

The Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act makes good on decades-old promises to restore land bases for the Coos and Cow Creek Tribes, and it puts the Coquille Indian Tribe's forest management on equal footing with those of other Indian tribes nationwide.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1306.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAINT FRANCIS DAM DISASTER NATIONAL MEMORIAL ACT

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2156) to provide for the establishment of a national memorial and national monument to commemorate those killed by the collapse of the Saint Francis Dam on March 12, 1928, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2156

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Memorial Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) On March 12, 1928, the Saint Francis Dam located in the northern portion of Los Angeles County, California, breached, resulting in a devastating flood that caused the death of approximately 425 individuals.

(2) The residents of Santa Clarita Valley, San Francisquito Canyon, Castaic Junction, Santa Clara River Valley, Piru, Fillmore, Bardsdale, Saticoy, and Santa Paula were directly impacted and suffered greatly from the worst flood in the history of the State of California.

(3) The disaster resulted in a tremendous loss of human life, property, and the livelihood of local residents, and was surpassed in the level of destruction in the 20th century only by the great San Francisco earthquake of 1906.

(4) The collapse of the dam may represent America's worst civil engineering failure in the 20th century.

(5) The site of the disaster is subject to the theft of historic artifacts, graffiti, and other vandalism.

(6) It is right to pay homage to the citizens who were killed, injured, or dislocated due to the flood, and to educate the public about this important historical event.

(7) It is appropriate that the site of the Saint Francis Dam and surrounding areas be specially designated and protected to commemorate this tragic event.

SEC. 3. SAINT FRANCIS DAM DISASTER NATIONAL MEMORIAL.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary is authorized to establish a memorial at the Saint Francis Dam site in the County of Los Angeles, California, for the purpose of honoring the victims of the Saint Francis Dam disaster of March 12, 1928.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The Memorial shall be—

(1) known as the Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Memorial; and

(2) managed by the Forest Service.

(c) DONATIONS.—The Secretary is authorized to accept, hold, administer, invest, and spend any gift, devise, or bequest of real or

personal property made to the Secretary for purposes of developing, designing, constructing, and managing the Memorial.

SEC. 4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MEMORIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress recommendations regarding—

(1) the planning, design, construction, and long-term management of the Memorial;

(2) the proposed boundaries of the Memorial;

(3) a visitor center and educational facilities at the Memorial; and

(4) ensuring public access to the Memorial.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In preparing the recommendations required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with—

(1) appropriate Federal agencies;

(2) State, tribal, and local governments, including the Santa Clarita City Council; and

(3) the public.

SEC. 5. ESTABLISHMENT OF SAINT FRANCIS DAM DISASTER NATIONAL MONUMENT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established as a national monument in the State, certain National Forest System land administered by the Secretary in the County of Los Angeles comprising approximately 440 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Proposed Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Monument", created on June 14, 2016, to be known as the Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Monument.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Monument is to conserve and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of the public the cultural, archaeological, historical, watershed, educational, and recreational resources and values of the Monument.

SEC. 6. DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY WITH RESPECT TO MONUMENT.

(a) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a management plan for the Monument.

(2) CONSULTATION.—The management plan shall be developed in consultation with—

(A) appropriate Federal agencies;

(B) State, tribal, and local governments; and

(C) the public.

(3) CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing and implementing the management plan, the Secretary shall, with respect to methods of protecting and providing access to the Monument, consider the recommendations of the Saint Francis Disaster National Memorial Foundation, the Santa Clarita Valley Historical Society, and the Community Hiking Club of Santa Clarita.

(b) MANAGEMENT.—The Secretary shall manage the Monument—

(1) in a manner that conserves and enhances the cultural and historic resources of the Monument; and

(2) in accordance with—

(A) the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.) and the laws generally applicable to the National Forest System;

(B) this Act; and

(C) any other applicable laws.

(c) USES.—

(1) USE OF MOTORIZED VEHICLES.—The use of motorized vehicles within the Monument may be permitted only—

(A) on roads designated for use by motorized vehicles in the management plan required under subsection (a);

(B) for administrative purposes; or

(C) for emergency responses.

(2) GRAZING.—The Secretary shall permit grazing within the Monument, where established before the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) subject to all applicable laws (including regulations and Executive orders); and

(B) consistent with the purpose described in section 5(b).

SEC. 7. CLARIFICATION ON FUNDING.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **MEMORIAL.**—The term “Memorial” means the Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Memorial authorized under section 3(a).

(2) **MONUMENT.**—The term “Monument” means the Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Monument established under section 5(a).

(3) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of California.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill currently under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Saint Francis Dam disaster is considered one of the worst civil engineering catastrophes in the 20th century.

H.R. 2156, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT), my good friend, recognizes the incident's devastation and subsequent impacts on the residents of northern Los Angeles County by establishing a national memorial and monument to preserve the area for future generations.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to establish the memorial using donations from the community, working in consultation with the Santa Clarita City Council and the public. No taxpayer funds are authorized for the construction of the memorial.

The bill also authorizes the creation of a 440-acre monument that will encompass the Saint Francis Dam memorial. The boundaries of the monument were designated in consultation with the local community, and the bill includes provisions to ensure motorized access within the monument and continued grazing on any land where it is already permitted.

The memorial and the monument created by this legislation are a fitting tribute to the 400 people who lost their lives tragically and thousands more whose lives were forever changed by the Saint Francis Dam disaster.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill introduced by Mr. KNIGHT, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In one of the worst civil engineering failures of the 20th century, the breach of the Saint Francis Dam, on March 12, 1928, tragically took the lives of over 400 Americans. To honor the memory of those who lost their lives on that fateful day, H.R. 2156 establishes a national memorial at the disaster site in California's Santa Clarita Valley. The memorial will provide a permanent place of remembrance and a place for healing.

In addition to the memorial, H.R. 2156 establishes the Saint Francis Dam National Monument on 440 acres of public land managed by the Forest Service. The national monument designation authorizes the U.S. Forest Service, in consultation with a range of stakeholders, to develop educational programs and improve the health of regional watersheds.

I want to thank Congresswoman JULIA BROWNLEY, as well as Congressman KNIGHT, along with the Santa Clarita Valley Historical Society, for bringing the legacy of the Saint Francis Dam disaster to the attention of Congress. As we have all heard: “Those who cannot remember the past are doomed to repeat it.”

This bill received strong support last Congress and was voted out of the House. This is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT), the author of the legislation.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this is something that is near and dear to my heart. This is something that has affected our community. It happened less than 20 miles from my house, almost 100 years ago, and today I rise in remembrance of the Saint Francis Dam and the bill I sponsored, which would establish a national memorial to honor those in this terrible tragedy.

The Saint Francis Dam failed on March 12, 1928, in the San Francisquito Canyon. Nearly 13 billion gallons of water crashed down upon the surrounding areas and, ultimately, traveled 54 miles down to the Pacific Ocean. The brute force of this floodwater claimed 437 lives, leaving in its wake unspeakable heartbreak and catastrophically impacted communities.

The Saint Francis Dam disaster was America's worst civil engineering failure of the 20th century. While the failure ultimately informed future dam construction and the development of new safety standards, these lessons were learned at a steep price. Many of the dams that were built after this were built because of the Saint Francis Dam issues, and they were built at a much different level.

This bill takes a small but significant step in memorializing the men, women, and children who lost their lives in this tragedy. Those individuals represent a solemn part of current-day Santa Clarita Valley's heritage, and I am humbled by this honor to commemorate their memory.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his support of this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote “yes.”

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2156.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LYTTON RANCHERIA HOMELANDS ACT OF 2017

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 597) to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 597

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Lytton Rancheria Homelands Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Lytton Rancheria of California is a federally recognized Indian tribe that lost its homeland after it was unjustly and unlawfully terminated in 1958. The Tribe was restored to Federal recognition in 1991, but the conditions of its restoration have prevented it from regaining a homeland on its original lands.

(2) Congress needs to take action to reverse historic injustices that befell the Tribe and have prevented it from regaining a viable homeland for its people.

(3) Prior to European contact there were as many as 350,000 Indians living in what is now the State of California. By the turn of the 19th century, that number had been reduced to approximately 15,000 individuals, many of them homeless and living in scattered bands and communities.

(4) The Lytton Rancheria's original homeland was purchased by the United States in 1926 pursuant to congressional authority designed to remedy the unique tragedy that befell the Indians of California and provide them with reservations called Rancherias to be held in trust by the United States.

(5) After the Lytton Rancheria lands were purchased by the United States, the Tribe settled on the land and sustained itself for several decades by farming and ranching.

(6) By the mid-1950s, Federal Indian policy had shifted back towards a policy of terminating Indian tribes. In 1958, Congress enacted the Rancheria Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 619), which slated 41 Rancherias in California, including the Lytton Rancheria, for termination after certain conditions were met.

(7) On August 1, 1961, the Lytton Rancheria was terminated by the Federal Government. This termination was illegal because the conditions for termination under the Rancheria Act had never been met. After termination was implemented, the Tribe lost its lands and was left without any means of supporting itself.

(8) In 1987, the Tribe joined three other tribes in a lawsuit against the United States challenging the illegal termination of their Rancherias. A Stipulated Judgment in the case, *Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians of the Sugar Bowl Rancheria v. United States*, No. C-86-3660 (N.D.Cal. March 22, 1991), restored the Lytton Rancheria to its status as a federally recognized Indian tribe.

(9) The Stipulated Judgment agreed that the Lytton Rancheria would have the "individual and collective status and rights" which it had prior to its termination and expressly contemplated the acquisition of trust lands for the Lytton Rancheria.

(10) The Stipulated Judgment contains provisions, included at the request of the local county governments and neighboring landowners, that prohibit the Lytton Rancheria from exercising its full Federal rights on its original homeland in the Alexander Valley.

(11) In 2000, approximately 9.5 acres of land in San Pablo, California, was placed in trust status for the Lytton Rancheria for economic development purposes.

(12) The Tribe has since acquired, from willing sellers at fair market value, property in Sonoma County near the Tribe's historic Rancheria. This property, which the Tribe holds in fee status, is suitable for a new homeland for the Tribe.

(13) On a portion of the land to be taken into trust, which portion totals approximately 124.12 acres, the Tribe plans to build housing for its members and governmental and community facilities.

(14) A portion of the land to be taken into trust is being used for viticulture, and the Tribe intends to develop more of the lands to be taken into trust for viticulture. The Tribe's investment in the ongoing viticulture operation has reinvigorated the vineyards, which are producing high-quality wines. The Tribe is operating its vineyards on a sustainable basis and is working toward certification of sustainability.

(15) No gaming shall be conducted on the lands to be taken into trust by this Act.

(16) No gaming shall be conducted on any lands taken into trust on behalf of the Tribe in Sonoma County after the date of the enactment of this Act north of a line that runs in a cardinal east and west direction from the point where Highway Route 12 crosses Highway 101 as they are physically on the ground and used for transportation on January 1, 2016, and extending to the furthest extent of Sonoma County.

(17) Any agreement, now or in the future, regarding gaming restrictions between Sonoma County and the Tribe will be effective without further review by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

(18) By directing that these lands be taken into trust, the United States will ensure that the Lytton Rancheria will finally have a permanently protected homeland on which they can once again live communally and plan for future generations. This action is necessary to fully restore the Tribe to the status it had before it was wrongfully terminated in 1961.

(19) The Tribe and County of Sonoma have entered into a Memorandum of Agreement in

which the County agrees to the lands in the County being taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe in consideration for commitments made by the Tribe.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For the purpose of this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) COUNTY.—The term "County" means Sonoma County, California.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) TRIBE.—The term "Tribe" means the Lytton Rancheria of California.

SEC. 4. LANDS TO BE TAKEN INTO TRUST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The land owned by the Tribe and generally depicted on the map titled "Lytton Fee Owned Property to be Taken into Trust" and dated May 1, 2015, is hereby taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe, subject to valid existing rights, contracts, and management agreements related to easements and rights-of-way.

(b) LANDS TO BE MADE PART OF THE RESERVATION.—Lands taken into trust under subsection (a) shall be part of the Tribe's reservation and shall be administered in accordance with the laws and regulations generally applicable to property held in trust by the United States for an Indian tribe.

SEC. 5. GAMING.

(a) LANDS TAKEN INTO TRUST UNDER THIS ACT.—Lands taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe under section 4 shall not be eligible for gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(b) OTHER LANDS TAKEN INTO TRUST.—

(1) TIME-LIMITED PROHIBITION.—Lands taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe in Sonoma County after the date of the enactment of this Act shall not be eligible for gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2710 et seq.) until after March 15, 2037.

(2) PERMANENT PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), lands located north of a line that runs in a cardinal east and west direction and is defined by California State Highway Route 12 as it crosses through Sonoma County at Highway 101 as they are physically on the ground and used for transportation on January 1, 2016, and extending to the furthest extent of Sonoma County shall not be eligible for gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2710 et seq.).

SEC. 6. APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LAW.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Memorandum of Agreement entered into by the Tribe and the County concerning taking land in the County into trust for the benefit of the Tribe, which was approved by the County Board of Supervisors on March 10, 2015, and any addenda and supplement thereto, is not subject to review or approval of the Secretary in order to be effective, including review or approval under section 2103 of the Revised Statutes (25 U.S.C. 81).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 597, sponsored by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), my colleague, would take into trust approximately 511 acres of land of noncontiguous fee land owned by the Lytton Rancheria. The land is adjacent to the town of Windsor, in Sonoma County, California. Under the bill, gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act is prohibited on these lands.

In 2009, the Tribe applied to the Department of the Interior to place title to approximately 127 acres of lands acquired in this area in trust. The application is still pending with the Department of the Interior.

The Tribe has testified that it intends to use a portion of the lands for Tribal housing, while the rest would support a diverse range of economic development, including plans for a future resort and winery.

I want to thank the sponsor of the legislation for his hard work on this bill, and I urge adoption of the measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Along with dozens of other California Tribes, the Lytton Band of Pomo Indians had its relationship with the Federal Government terminated in 1958. That resulted in the loss of its Federal status and all of its Tribal lands.

The Tribe's federally recognized status was eventually restored, but their reservation lands were not. As a result, with the exception of a small parcel of land that Congress provided for gaming in San Pablo, the Tribe has been left essentially landless and without a reservation since it was terminated.

This bill will take approximately 511 acres in Sonoma County into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria. By directing these lands into trust, the United States will ensure that the Lytton Rancheria will finally have a permanently protected homeland on which they can, once again, live communally and plan for future generations.

I commend Representative DENHAM, my neighbor to the east, for this bipartisan legislation, and I urge quick adoption of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 597.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Mariel Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1397, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1719, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

INTERAGENCY TRANSFER OF LAND ALONG GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1397) to authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal land, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 0, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

YEAS—406

Abraham	Bera	Brady (PA)
Adams	Bergman	Brady (TX)
Aderholt	Beyer	Brat
Aguilar	Biggs	Bridenstine
Allen	Bilirakis	Brooks (AL)
Amash	Bishop (GA)	Brooks (IN)
Amodei	Bishop (MI)	Brown (MD)
Arrington	Bishop (UT)	Brownley (CA)
Babin	Black	Buchanan
Bacon	Blackburn	Buck
Banks (IN)	Blum	Bucshon
Barletta	Blumenauer	Budd
Barr	Blunt Rochester	Burgess
Barragán	Bonamici	Bustos
Barton	Bost	Byrne
Bass	Boyle, Brendan	Calvert
Beatty	F.	Capuano

Carbajal	Green, Al	McClintock
Cárdenas	Green, Gene	McCollum
Carson (IN)	Griffith	McEachin
Carter (GA)	Grothman	McGovern
Carter (TX)	Guthrie	McHenry
Cartwright	Hanabusa	McKinley
Castor (FL)	Handel	McMorris
Castro (TX)	Harper	Rodgers
Chabot	Harris	McNerney
Cheney	Hartzler	McSally
Chu, Judy	Hastings	Meadows
Ciçilline	Heck	Meehan
Clark (MA)	Hensarling	Meeks
Clarke (NY)	Herrera Beutler	Meng
Clay	Hice, Jody B.	Messer
Clyburn	Higgins (LA)	Mitchell
Coffman	Higgins (NY)	Moolenaar
Cohen	Hill	Mooney (WV)
Cole	Himes	Moulton
Collins (NY)	Holding	Mullin
Comer	Hollingsworth	Murphy (FL)
Comstock	Hudson	Murphy (PA)
Conaway	Huffman	Nadler
Connolly	Huizenga	Neal
Conyers	Hultgren	Newhouse
Cook	Hunter	Noem
Cooper	Issa	Nolan
Correa	Jackson Lee	Norcross
Costa	Jayapal	Norman
Costello (PA)	Jeffries	Nunes
Courtney	Jenkins (KS)	O'Halleran
Cramer	Jenkins (WV)	O'Rourke
Crawford	Johnson (GA)	Olson
Crist	Johnson (LA)	Palazzo
Crowley	Johnson (OH)	Pallone
Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Palmer
Culberson	Jones	Panetta
Curbelo (FL)	Jordan	Pascarell
Davidson	Joyce (OH)	Paulsen
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Payne
Davis, Danny	Katko	Pelosi
Davis, Rodney	Keating	Perry
DeFazio	Kelly (IL)	Peters
DeGette	Kelly (MS)	Peterson
Delaney	Kelly (PA)	Pingree
DeLauro	Kennedy	Pittenger
DelBene	Khanna	Pocan
Demings	Kihuen	Poe (TX)
Denham	Kildee	Poliquin
Dent	Kilmer	Polis
DeSantis	Kind	Posey
DeSaulnier	King (IA)	Price (NC)
DesJarlais	King (NY)	Quigley
Deutch	Kinzinger	Ratcliffe
Diaz-Balart	Knight	Reed
Dingell	Krishnamoorthi	Reichert
Doggett	Kuster (NH)	Renacci
Donovan	Kustoff (TN)	Rice (NY)
Doyle, Michael	Labrador	Rice (SC)
F.	LaHood	Richmond
Duffy	LaMalfa	Roby
Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Roe (TN)
Dunn	Lance	Rogers (AL)
Ellison	Langevin	Rogers (KY)
Emmer	Larsen (WA)	Rokita
Engel	Latta	Rooney, Francis
Eshoo	Lawrence	Ros-Lehtinen
Espallat	Lawson (FL)	Rosen
Estes (KS)	Lee	Roskam
Esty (CT)	Levin	Ross
Evans	Lewis (GA)	Rothfus
Farenthold	Lewis (MN)	Rouzer
Faso	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Ferguson	LoBiondo	Royce (CA)
Fitzpatrick	Loeb sack	Ruiz
Fleischmann	Lofgren	Ruppersberger
Flores	Long	Rush
Fortenberry	Loudermilk	Russell
Foster	Love	Rutherford
Fox	Lowenthal	Ryan (OH)
Frankel (FL)	Lowey	Sánchez
Franks (AZ)	Lucas	Sanford
Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Sarbanes
Fudge	Lujan Grisham,	Schakowsky
Gabbard	M.	Schiff
Gallagher	Luján, Ben Ray	Schneider
Gallego	Lynch	Schrader
Garamendi	MacArthur	Scott (VA)
Gianforte	Maloney,	Scott, Austin
Gibbs	Carolyn B.	Scott, David
Gohmert	Maloney, Sean	Sensenbrenner
Gonzalez (TX)	Marchant	Serrano
Goodlatte	Marino	Sessions
Gottheimer	Marshall	Sewell (AL)
Govdy	Massie	Shea-Porter
Granger	Mast	Sherman
Graves (GA)	Matsui	Shimkus
Graves (LA)	McCarthy	Shuster
Graves (MO)	McCaul	Simpson

Sinema	Tiberi	Wasserman
Sires	Tipton	Schultz
Slaughter	Tonko	Waters, Maxine
Smith (MO)	Torres	Watson Coleman
Smith (NE)	Trott	Weber (TX)
Smith (NJ)	Tsongas	Webster (FL)
Smith (TX)	Turner	Welch
Smith (WA)	Upton	Wenstrup
Soto	Valadao	Westerman
Speier	Vargas	Williams
Stefanik	Veasey	Wilson (FL)
Stewart	Vela	Wilson (SC)
Stivers	Velázquez	Wittman
Suozzi	Visclosky	Womack
Swalwell (CA)	Wagner	Woodall
Takano	Walberg	Yarmuth
Taylor	Walden	Yoder
Tenney	Walker	Yoho
Thompson (CA)	Walorski	Young (AK)
Thompson (MS)	Walters, Mimi	Young (IA)
Thompson (PA)	Walz	Zeldin
Thornberry		

NOT VOTING—26

Butterfield	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Cleaver	Hoyer	Raskin
Collins (GA)	Hurd	Rohrabacher
Cummings	Johnson, Sam	Rooney, Thomas
Duncan (TN)	Larson (CT)	J.
Gaetz	Lieu, Ted	Scalise
Garrett	Moore	Schweikert
Gosar	Napolitano	Smucker
Grijalva	Pearce	Titus

□ 1853

Mr. WENSTRUP changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of the Certificate of Election received from the Honorable Alex Padilla, California Secretary of State, indicating that, at the Special Election held on June 6, 2017, the Honorable Jimmy Gomez was duly elected Representative in Congress for the 34th Congressional District, State of California.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

I, Alex Padilla, Secretary of State of the State of California, hereby certify that according to information concerning the statement of the results of the Special General Election held on the 6th day of June, 2017, on file in my office, Jimmy Gomez was elected to the office of United States Representative District 34.

In witness whereof, I hereunto set my hand and affix the Great Seal of the State of California, at Sacramento, this 19th day of June, 2017.

ALEX PADILLA,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE JIMMY GOMEZ, OF CALIFORNIA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect Gomez and the members of the California delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise his right hand.

Mr. GOMEZ appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 115th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE JIMMY GOMEZ TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Democratic delegation of California, I am so very pleased to welcome the newest member of the California delegation, Congressman JIMMY GOMEZ.

Congressman GOMEZ will represent the people of the 34th Congressional District.

Congressman GOMEZ was elected to the California State Assembly in 2012 and reelected in 2014, and most recently in 2016, with over 86 percent of the vote, to represent California's 51st assembly district.

In the assembly, Congressman GOMEZ was a national champion of paid family leave. Congressman GOMEZ authored and passed legislation, Assembly Bill 908, the Nation's most progressive expansion of paid family leave, that President Obama held as a model for Congress.

JIMMY also authored legislation to address public health, environmental justice, water conservation, and access to education.

We are all looking forward to Representative GOMEZ expanding and continuing his work in the United States Congress. I hope Members will all join me in welcoming him to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ).

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank everyone for the warm welcome.

I also want to thank Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY for all the attention he has given me for the past several weeks. Thank you so much.

I am truly honored to be here and to be joined by my mother, Socorro; my

brother, Gerry; my mother-in-law, Sally; and, of course, my amazing wife, Mary.

My approach to public policy, politics, and government is shaped by the experiences of my family and of my community. As the son of immigrants who believes in this country and everything it promises, I am a living embodiment of that promise. I have a profound commitment to protecting the rights of immigrants no matter where they are from and no matter what God they worship.

I am also a fighter for universal healthcare, because when I was 7 years old, I ended up in the hospital with pneumonia, and that 1-week stay in the hospital almost bankrupted my family.

I also believe that young people from working families should have access to debt-free education, because I know from my own personal experience that a high school degree is not always enough, and that is why a higher education can actually transform an individual's life.

I believe everyone deserves access to clean air and clean water and that climate change has exacerbated that challenge.

And lastly, I don't believe in the hype and the false divides that progressives can't be for working families and for families from all over America.

To the people of the 34th Congressional District, I know why they sent me to Congress. They want me to fight for our families, our State, and our values, and I will do that every single day, and I won't let them down.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from California, the whole number of the House is 434.

JOHN MUIR NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE EXPANSION ACT

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1719) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 15, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

YEAS—401

Abraham	Denham	Kennedy
Adams	Dent	Khanna
Aderholt	DeSantis	Kihuen
Aguilar	DeSaulnier	Kildee
Allen	DesJarlais	Kilmer
Amodei	Deuth	Kind
Arrington	Diaz-Balart	King (IA)
Bacon	Dingell	King (NY)
Banks (IN)	Doggett	Kinzinger
Barletta	Donovan	Knight
Barr	Doyle, Michael	Krishnamoorthi
Barragán	F.	Kuster (NH)
Barton	Duffy	Kustoff (TN)
Bass	Duncan (SC)	Labrador
Beatty	Dunn	LaHood
Bera	Ellison	LaMalfa
Bergman	Emmer	Lamborn
Beyer	Engel	Lance
Bilirakis	Eshoo	Langevin
Bishop (GA)	Espallat	Larsen (WA)
Bishop (MI)	Estes (KS)	Larson (CT)
Bishop (UT)	Esty (CT)	Latta
Black	Evans	Lawrence
Blackburn	Farenthold	Lawson (FL)
Blum	Faso	Lee
Blumenauer	Ferguson	Levin
Blunt Rochester	Fitzpatrick	Lewis (GA)
Bonamici	Fleischmann	Lewis (MN)
Bost	Flores	Lipinski
Boyle, Brendan	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
F.	Foster	Loebsack
Brady (PA)	Fox	Lofgren
Brady (TX)	Frankel (FL)	Long
Bridenstine	Franks (AZ)	Loudermilk
Brooks (AL)	Frelinghuysen	Love
Brooks (IN)	Fudge	Lowenthal
Brown (MD)	Gabbard	Lowey
Brownley (CA)	Gaetz	Lucas
Buchanan	Gallagher	Luetkemeyer
Buck	Gallego	Lujan Grisham,
Bucshon	Garamendi	M.
Burgess	Gianforte	Luján, Ben Ray
Bustos	Gibbs	Lynch
Byrne	Gohmert	MacArthur
Calvert	Gomez	Maloney,
Capuano	Gonzalez (TX)	Carolyn B.
Carbajal	Goodlatte	Maloney, Sean
Cárdenas	Gottheimer	Marchant
Carson (IN)	Gowdy	Marino
Carter (GA)	Granger	Marshall
Carter (TX)	Graves (GA)	Mast
Cartwright	Graves (LA)	Matsui
Castor (FL)	Graves (MO)	McCarthy
Castro (TX)	Green, Al	McCaul
Chabot	Green, Gene	McClintock
Cheney	Grijalva	McCollum
Chu, Judy	Grothman	McEachin
Ciilline	Guthrie	McGovern
Clark (MA)	Hanabusa	McHenry
Clarke (NY)	Handel	McKinley
Clay	Harper	McMorris
Cleaver	Hartzler	Rodgers
Clyburn	Hastings	McNerney
Coffman	Heck	McSally
Cohen	Hensarling	Meadows
Cole	Herrera Beutler	Meehan
Collins (GA)	Hice, Jody B.	Meeks
Collins (NY)	Higgins (LA)	Meng
Comer	Higgins (NY)	Messer
Comstock	Hill	Mitchell
Conaway	Himes	Moolenaar
Connolly	Holding	Moulton
Conyers	Hollingsworth	Mullin
Cook	Hoyer	Murphy (FL)
Cooper	Hudson	Murphy (PA)
Correa	Huffman	Nadler
Costa	Huizenga	Neal
Costello (PA)	Hultgren	Newhouse
Courtney	Hunter	Noem
Cramer	Issa	Nolan
Crawford	Jackson Lee	Norcross
Crist	Jayapal	Norman
Crowley	Jeffries	Nunes
Cuellar	Jenkins (KS)	O'Halleran
Culberson	Jenkins (WV)	O'Rourke
Curbelo (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Olson
Davidson	Johnson (LA)	Palazzo
Davis (CA)	Johnson (OH)	Pallone
Davis, Danny	Johnson, E. B.	Palmer
Davis, Rodney	Joyce (OH)	Panetta
DeFazio	Kaptur	Pascrell
DeGette	Katko	Paulsen
Delaney	Keating	Payne
DeLauro	Kelly (IL)	Pelosi
DelBene	Kelly (MS)	Perry
Demings	Kelly (PA)	Peters

Peterson	Schiff	Tipton
Pingree	Schneider	Tonko
Pittenger	Schrader	Torres
Pocan	Schweikert	Trott
Poe (TX)	Tsongas	Tsongas
Poliquin	Scott, Austin	Turner
Polis	Scott, David	Upton
Posey	Sensenbrenner	Valadao
Price (NC)	Serrano	Vargas
Quigley	Sessions	Veasey
Ratcliffe	Sewell (AL)	Vela
Reed	Shea-Porter	Velázquez
Reichert	Sherman	Visclosky
Renacci	Shimkus	Wagner
Rice (NY)	Shuster	Walberg
Rice (SC)	Simpson	Walden
Richmond	Sinema	Walker
Roby	Sires	Walorski
Roe (TN)	Slaughter	Walters, Mimi
Rogers (AL)	Smith (MO)	Walz
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Wasserman
Rokita	Smith (NJ)	Schultz
Rooney, Francis	Smith (TX)	Waters, Maxine
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (WA)	Watson Coleman
Rosen	Smucker	Webster (FL)
Roskam	Soto	Welch
Ross	Speler	Westrup
Rothfus	Stefanik	Westerman
Roybal-Allard	Stewart	Williams
Royce (CA)	Stivers	Wilson (FL)
Ruiz	Suozzi	Wilson (SC)
Ruppersberger	Swalwell (CA)	Wittman
Rush	Takano	Womack
Russell	Taylor	Woodall
Rutherford	Tenney	Yarmuth
Ryan (OH)	Thompson (CA)	Yoder
Sánchez	Thompson (MS)	Young (AK)
Sanford	Thompson (PA)	Young (IA)
Sarbanes	Thornberry	Zeldin
Schakowsky	Tiberi	

NAYS—15

Amash	Garrett	Massie
Babin	Griffith	Mooney (WV)
Biggs	Harris	Rouzer
Brat	Jones	Weber (TX)
Budd	Jordan	Yoho

NOT VOTING—17

Butterfield	Johnson, Sam	Raskin
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Rohrabacher
Duncan (TN)	Moore	Rooney, Thomas
Gosar	Napolitano	J.
Gutiérrez	Pearce	Scalise
Hurd	Perlmutter	Titus

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1910

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, for inclusion in the John Muir National Historic Site, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 345, and "yea" on rollcall No. 346.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I attended the funeral of a close family member and was unable to fly back to the Capitol in time for votes today. Had I been present to vote, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 1397, To authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal land, and for other purposes, and "yea" on H.R. 1719, the John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 622

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 622, a bill originally introduced by Representative Chaffetz of Utah, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to file a supplemental report on the bill, H.R. 2810.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

VENEZUELA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, for more than 100 days, the Venezuelan people have been courageously protesting peacefully on the streets against the abusive regime of Nicolas Maduro.

Since June, more than 1,400 people have been injured, over 3,600 have been detained, and over 100 people have been killed by Maduro's thugs.

Just days ago, Maduro moved opposition leader Leopoldo Lopez to house arrest after more than 3 unjust years in prison. But this diversion tactic is not enough. All political prisoners must be released.

Maduro's fraudulent constituent assembly must be stopped. And more names must be added to the sanctions list, especially those human rights abusers who are responsible for the violent actions against innocent civilians.

This will send a strong message that the United States stands with the people in their struggle for democracy and for justice for all Venezuelans.

UTILIZING UAS FOR INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND DISASTER RELIEF

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, during the full committee markup of the fis-

cal year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act, the House Armed Services Committee came together to produce a strong bipartisan bill that will ensure investment in and oversight of our military. We also recognized how valuable the Department is to international humanitarian assistance and disaster relief efforts as well.

During markup, I offered an amendment that will require the Department to assess the viability of unmanned aircraft systems in support of international humanitarian aid missions. Although it is well understood that the DOD has operated UAS platforms effectively for over a decade in offensive roles, I believe it is also important we recognize the capabilities of UAS platforms to increase the speed and quality of response forces providing disaster relief and medical assistance to those suffering around the world. Think of critical disaster efforts, whereby vital medicine and supplies are needed quickly. UAS could very well make all the difference between life and death.

I am pleased that this amendment was adopted during markup, and I thank my colleagues for their support of this endeavor.

□ 1915

OFFICER DOWN: MIOSOTIS FAMILIA

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as fireworks boomed in the sky above the Bronx, 48-year-old law officer Miosotis Familia sat in a mobile command unit. She was a good officer.

Known for her no-nonsense approach to law enforcement, she was friendly with the neighborhood, spoke Spanish, and was always quick with a smile and a wave. But suddenly, an evil outlaw appeared at her window and, with a heart fatally bent on mischief, pointed a .38-caliber revolver through the window and pulled the trigger, cold-bloodedly murdering Officer Familia.

She wore the uniform with the badge, the shield over her heart.

Officer Familia was one of 10 siblings from an immigrant family from the Dominican Republic, and she had three children of her own.

Our men and women in blue are being targeted, gunned down for simply wearing the uniform, gunned down by the scourge that prey on the police.

Congress should take action and protect those who serve our Nation every day, all day, on the streets of America. Senator CORNYN and I have introduced the Back the Blue Act of 2017, which increases the penalties for the soulless criminals who intentionally target the law enforcement community.

Peace officers are the last strand of wire in the fence between the law and the lawless, between good and evil.

Taps has been played for the end of watch for Officer Familia. Her life may

be gone, but her service and sacrifice are a reminder of those who give their lives to the thin blue line.

So back the blue, Mr. Speaker, back the blue.

And that is just the way it is.

THE INVESTIGATION MUST CONTINUE

(Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, Donald Trump, Jr., has documented that he, Jared Kushner, and former Trump campaign chairman Paul Manafort met with a Russian lawyer with the understanding that she was a Russian Government agent and would provide damaging information on Hillary Clinton as part of Moscow's effort to help President Trump's campaign.

The attempt by these top advisers to solicit the support of a hostile foreign power to win the American Presidency is unprecedented in our history.

When an American political campaign is approached by a foreign source promising information on an opponent, they should contact the FBI. Unfortunately, the Trump campaign, instead, scheduled a meeting.

All those who participated in the Trump Tower meeting must testify under oath before Congress. Mr. Trump, Mr. Manafort, Mr. Kushner, Mr. Goldstone, and Ms. Veselnitskaya must disclose to Congress the nature and details of their conversations, including any sources in the Kremlin.

Special Counsel Mueller's investigation must continue, and so must ours.

CONGRATULATING MINNETONKA BOYS TENNIS CHAMPS

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Minnetonka High School boys tennis team on their recent extraordinary State tournament victory. The Skippers won their second consecutive State title, led by Senior Adam Thompson and Junior Ben Wheaton.

The team worked hard to win, with a final score of 4-3. This close victory displayed their competitive skill, and the way the Skippers carried themselves after the victory epitomizes the virtue of sportsmanship and humility.

Mr. Speaker, with their strong determination and commitment to excellence, these student athletes exemplify the very best of their school and of our community. They excel both on the court and in the classroom.

I offer my congratulations to the players, the coaches, and the parents. Congratulations to the Minnetonka boys tennis team on their victory and becoming State champs.

THE PUBLIC TRUST HAS BEEN VIOLATED

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the son of Mr. Trump knew full well that he was accepting an invitation from a chain of individuals affiliated with the Kremlin: first, the liaison guy, the publicist, an operative of the Kremlin; the entertainer, the operative of the Kremlin; and then the attorney, who has affiliations through her family with the Kremlin. And then the idea was to receive information from a foreign, hostile nation about the opponent of his father.

With all of his outpouring of honesty now, the question has to be why was this meeting hidden, and it has to be whether we are on the brink of seeing a situation where those involved have acted against the interests of the United States of America.

Having just come back from a former Soviet bloc country, I know the distinction between the freedom in this Nation and the non-freedom that Putin believes in. So I think it is important, as I have said over and over again, that the House Judiciary Committee needs to open up its investigation, take oversight over issues that are relevant to the Constitution and, of course, those individuals who are holding the public trust.

The public trust has been violated, but I believe seriously that something more has been violated. There is Russian collusion: collusion in the election, skewing the idea of a fair election. This is what we are dealing with, and I am saddened by this situation.

The Judiciary Committee must investigate the skewing of the election toward one candidate over another.

RECOGNIZING PENN STATE UNIVERSITY CRITICAL LANGUAGE SCHOLARS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize two Penn State University students who received critical language scholarships following their completion of the U.S. Department of State's Critical Language Scholarship Program in the summer of 2016.

The following students were two of the 564 total selected participants. A total of 5,700 students applied.

Janet Purdy, of State College, reached an intermediate level of Swahili while studying in Tanzania; and Erika Pugh, of Boalsburg, achieved an advanced level of Arabic while studying in Russia.

The Critical Language Scholarship Program is a crucial component of our Federal Government's goal to encourage Americans to master languages

that are essential to our national security and economic prosperity. These students study abroad in rigorous summer institutes, learning these critical foreign languages, while engaging with citizens of the host countries to further their cultural educations.

We are proud of these two outstanding students from the Pennsylvania State University for their achievements. Congratulations, Janet and Erika.

RUSSIA'S ONGOING ASSAULT ON OUR DEMOCRACY CANNOT GO UNANSWERED

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, Russia's ongoing assault on our democracy and democracies around the globe cannot go unanswered.

It has been a month since Russian sanctions passed the Senate 97-2, yet House Republican leaders continue to stall on bringing that worthy bill forward here. Why? Who or what are they protecting? Surely not liberty.

Putin's Russia targets journalists and political opponents for death. He shelters hackers that target democratic nations, including ours, and Russia hacks businesses to enrich Putin's cronies.

Russia's illegal invasion of sovereign nations, the latest being Ukraine, with over 10,000 dead and over 2 million displaced, reminds us of the evil brutality of Russia's kleptocratic rulers. Russia's damaging expansionism needs to be stopped.

Despite earlier denials, reports state that Donald Trump, Jr., Jared Kushner, and Trump campaign manager Paul Manafort knowingly met with a Kremlin-aligned lawyer to secure damaging information about Hillary Clinton. This administration is not acting in the national interest, and the victim of their encounters is liberty herself.

Let House Republican leaders stop the delays and bring forward strong sanctions legislation on Russia. Let us defend liberty and our rule of law as a beacon of hope for people everywhere, even those living in the grim reality of Russia.

A VISIT TO ANIMAL ADVENTURE PARK

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a new friend I made last week as I was traveling through the 22nd Congressional District: April the Giraffe.

April is a resident of the Animal Adventure Park in Harpersville, New York; and many of you may already know April as the star of the Giraffe

Cam which garnered worldwide attention this spring. The Giraffe Cam captured April giving birth to her baby calf, Tajiri. The live video was watched by more than 1 million viewers worldwide.

I am happy to report that April and I had a great meeting and that Tajiri is growing and doing very well in the Animal Adventure Park. I also had the unique opportunity to pose for a selfie with April from high atop a perch. She was much obliging, especially since I had some carrots to offer her.

Most importantly, during my visit to Animal Adventure Park, which is a beautiful preservation of wild animals from around the world, I learned that over the last 30 years the giraffe population numbers have declined by over 40 percent, and giraffes are now listed in the category of “vulnerable to extinction,” an important reminder that we can all do more to preserve wildlife and to protect precious wild species such as April and her darling baby, Taj, that share the planet with us.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF MRS. MARTHA RIVERA CHAVIS

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mrs. Martha Rivera Chavis, who passed away on July 6, 2017, at her home in Montclair, New Jersey.

After receiving her degree in French civilization at the Sorbonne University in Paris, France, Mrs. Rivera Chavis served as the French-to-Portuguese translator for Angola’s Ambassador to the United Nations. It was there she met Reverend Dr. Benjamin F. Chavis, Jr., a civil rights leader and president of the National Newspaper Publishers Association.

After marrying in 1988, Mrs. Rivera Chavis and her husband cared for nine Angolans, including six children with missing limbs, at their home in Montclair. Mrs. Rivera Chavis carried that empathy and compassion with her throughout life, including during her tenure as the head of the Women in NAACP committee, where she fought for justice, equality, and freedom for minority communities.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Rivera Chavis will be greatly missed by all who knew her. I send my thoughts and prayers to her husband, Benjamin, and her children and loved ones.

PEOPLE ARE WORRIED ABOUT HEALTHCARE

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, last week, as I traveled throughout my district, I heard time and time and time again from people worried about one

issue: healthcare. I heard stories like Diane’s in Mundelein, who was able to get affordable coverage through ACA after losing her job of 30 years to outsourcing, and Claire’s, from Vernon Hills, who was diagnosed with neurofibromatosis just a month before her 26th birthday. Yet, because of ACA, she has insurance today, despite her preexisting condition.

I was thrilled to learn that Claire recently got married, and is looking forward to pursuing her dreams: raising a family and living a long and productive life.

Mr. Speaker, across the country, there are millions of stories just like these. The ACA is far from perfect and it needs work. I heard that from my constituents as well.

I urge my colleagues here in Congress to listen to the people who share their stories with me and others and end this ill-considered repeal effort. Instead, let’s get to work together to deliver quality, affordable healthcare for all Americans.

□ 1930

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES 399.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 399. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUTHERFORD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXECUTIVE ORDER AMENDING EXECUTIVE ORDER 13761—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-51)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with subsection 401(b) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(b), and subsection 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(b), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the “order”) that amends Executive Order 13761 of January 13, 2017, by changing certain effective dates and revokes a reporting requirement in that order.

The order changes the date by which the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, is to provide a report to the President on the Government of Sudan’s progress in sustaining the positive actions taken by the Government of Sudan that gave rise to Executive Order 13761, from July 12, 2017, to October 12, 2017. The

order also changes from July 12, 2017, to October 12, 2017, the effective date for the revocation of sections 1 and 2 of Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, and the entirety of Executive Order 13412 of October 13, 2006, provided that the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, publishes on or before October 12, 2017, a notice in the *Federal Register* stating that the Government of Sudan has sustained the positive actions that gave rise to the order and has provided to the President the report described above.

The order revokes the requirement in Executive Order 13761 to provide an updated version of the report annually thereafter and, concurrent with those reports, to publish in the *Federal Register* a notice stating whether the Government of Sudan has sustained the positive actions that gave rise to Executive Order 13761.

The President issued Executive Orders 13067 and 13412, among other orders, to deal with the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the actions and policies of the Government of Sudan, including support for international terrorism; efforts to destabilize neighboring governments; and the prevalence of human rights violations.

In Executive Order 13761, the President determined that the situation that gave rise to the actions taken in Executive Order 13067 and Executive Order 13412 related to the policies and actions of the Government of Sudan had been altered by Sudan’s positive actions over the prior 6 months. Executive Order 13761 directed the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, and based on a consideration of relevant and credible information from available sources, including nongovernmental organizations, on or before July 12, 2017, to provide a report to the President on the Government of Sudan’s progress in sustaining its positive actions that gave rise to Executive Order 13761. Executive Order 13761 further provided that if the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, published on or before July 12, 2017, a notice in the *Federal Register* stating that the Government of Sudan had sustained the positive actions that gave rise to Executive Order 13761 and had provided to the President the report described above, the revocation of sections 1 and 2 of Executive Order 13067 and the revocation of Executive Order 13412 would become effective.

While the Government of Sudan has made some progress in areas identified

in Executive Order 13761, I have decided that more time is needed for this review to establish that the Government of Sudan has demonstrated sufficient positive action across all of those areas.

For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to amend the effective date to October 12, 2017, to provide the report required by Executive Order 13761 and revoke sections 1 and 2 of Executive Order 13067 and Executive Order 13412, provided that further action is taken by the Secretary of State, as set forth in Executive Order 13761, and to revoke the subsequent annual reporting requirement in Executive Order 13761.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 11, 2017.

THE TEST OF OUR PROGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to this hour, although I will probably take something less than that.

I want to bring to the attention of the House and, more beyond that, the citizens of the United States what is happening here with all this talk about the repeal of the Affordable Care Act. I want to spend some time on that issue. I want to review exactly what the Affordable Care Act has done for Americans and what the repeal would do to Americans. Those are really two different ways to look at this.

I want to start someplace else that has been a very special part of my thinking about government issues, about policies of all kinds, and it was something that Franklin Delano Roosevelt said during the height of the Depression as the American government and Mr. Roosevelt were talking about the various policies that were being discussed at the time. He laid out a test to which he would apply his judgment of a policy. It reads this way: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is rather we provide enough for those who have too little."

I see this as a profound and extremely important criteria upon which to judge many policies that come before us in bills, but it is also, I think, an extremely valuable way to judge the question of the Affordable Care Act: Has it added much to those who have little?

I will try to answer that in a few moments.

Similarly, in looking at the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, the test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much. When we consider the repeal of the Af-

fordable Care Act—ObamaCare—does it add to those who have much? Does it add to those who have little?

I will try to answer these questions in just a few moments.

So does the Affordable Care Act add much to those who have little?

The answer is: Categorically, it does. There is absolutely no doubt that the Affordable Care Act has helped those who have little. I will give a couple of examples. Just a couple.

One, a beauty salon operator in Sacramento, California, around the age of 30, married, wanting to have children but not able to do so because she had no insurance. A small-business operator, herself, maybe one part-time employee, unable to get insurance prior to the Affordable Care Act.

My wife visited her after the Affordable Care Act went into place, and she was able to purchase private insurance through the subsidized market, and she happily, excitedly told my wife: And now my husband and I, we are going to have a baby. At last I have the insurance. And I want you to tell your husband "thank you."

That thanks is not to me. It is to the men and women of the Congress in 2010, myself included, and the Senate, and President Obama that signed the Affordable Care Act that set up a situation in which, through the California exchange, similar to other State exchanges, she was able to purchase insurance. Subsidized to be sure, but nonetheless, she was on her way to having a baby, or at least thinking about having a baby. I will come back to her in a few moments.

A second person, small family farmer in my district unable to have insurance throughout her entire adult life. In and out of hospitals for everything from an accident on the farm to some more serious things. Facing bankruptcy. The Affordable Care Act gave her the opportunity to have insurance, to stabilize her life, her healthcare, and, importantly, be able to avoid the financial disaster of a major medical bill that would have clearly bankrupted her and put her out on the street.

That is what the Affordable Care Act did to two constituents in my district. And that story is repeated over 20 million times around this Nation. More than 20 million Americans have been able to get health insurance as a result of Affordable Care Act. And 6.1 million young Americans have been able to stay on their parents' insurance policies, not thrown off at the age of 18, but able to stay on until the age of 25. And 27 percent of Americans who have preexisting conditions—27 percent of us have some sort of preexisting condition—no longer a bar to being able to get insurance.

I was the insurance commissioner in California for 8 years, and I saw the forms that the insurance companies would require be filled out. Everything in their life from the moment of their birth—in fact, before their birth, they needed to disclose every single event.

Did you have pneumonia? Did you have an illness of this or that? All the way down the line.

And if you answered "yes" to any one of those, you would probably not be able to get insurance. And 27 percent of the American public unable to buy insurance because of preexisting conditions, no longer the case in America today. It is gone. That is history.

This is my experience. Thousands of times I saw this. If a person went through that entire checklist and there was some inaccuracy in the way they answered those questions and they went to the hospital with a serious illness that was supposed to be covered, it was common for the insurance companies to go back and do medical underwriting after the event and deny the coverage. Common practice.

Something as mundane as: I did not have mumps when I was a child. Check, check, check. Oh, you had mumps? I am sorry, we are not going to pay for this operation.

Those days are gone. The Affordable Care Act did that.

In my own State of California, 3.7 million Californians are now insured due to the Medicaid expansion program, which we call Medi-Cal in California. And 1.4 million people now have insurance through the exchange. The two examples I gave are but two of 1.4 million Californians that have insurance. So it works. And it is not just that. There are other things.

Seniors, the infamous doughnut hole in which, under Medicare part D, the first couple of thousand dollars of drug expenses would be covered. And then serious illnesses, you blow through that quickly, and then you faced the doughnut hole, and it was out of your pocket.

So you found seniors all across this country unable to afford the continuation of the drugs that kept them alive. It is gone—or will soon be gone. The Affordable Care Act collapses that doughnut hole so that in another 1½ years, 2 years from now it would be gone and the Medicare part D would provide the drugs that are necessary to keep seniors alive.

The repeal of the Affordable Care Act would end that and send those seniors back where they were before, facing the ominous doughnut hole. It goes on and on.

Medicaid expansion, 20 million Americans covered; 3.7 million in California. The drop in insurance rates. Due to the Affordable Care Act, the uninsured rate is now the lowest in history.

Consider this: 16 percent of Americans in 2010, before the Affordable Care Act, did not have insurance—16 percent of the 380 million of us.

□ 1945

Today, it is down to just about 8 percent—excuse me, that is in 2016. There has been continued improvements since then, 8 percent. That is where those 22 million Americans are.

So we have seen this over time. As a result of the Affordable Care Act, the

uninsured in America have steadily decreased as the Affordable Care Act has taken hold.

Hospital-acquired infections significantly reduced. Under the Affordable Care Act, unnecessary hospital readmissions due to infections, have fallen for the first time on record, dropping 8 percent between 2010 and 2015. Why has this happened, you ask? Because in the Affordable Care Act, there was a serious financial penalty to hospitals when there was a readmission as a result of a hospital-acquired infection.

Is that important? It certainly is, for those who are not readmitted for infections.

The annual lifetime benefits, you have heard about this. You know somebody in your family, in your community, who had a limit on their insurance policy, \$100,000 a year, or maybe a lifetime exclusion or limit of \$200,000, or \$300,000, or some number. If you have a serious illness, you blow right up through that barrier, and your coverage, it is on your account. Hospital coverage and expenses are no longer covered by the insurance policy.

That is gone. It is over. It doesn't exist any longer in the United States. So the end to annual and lifetime limits is a direct result of the Affordable Care Act.

Slower premium growth and a cap on out-of-pocket expenses. Due to the Affordable Care Act, all health policies now have a limit on out-of-pocket costs, which benefits all Americans.

Free preventative care. Have you talked to any seniors recently? If you are on Medicare, you have an annual free checkup. What does that mean? It means that your high blood pressure that you didn't know about, your onset for diabetes and other illnesses, you find out about it, deal with it, live longer, reduce the costs.

In part, that is the reason that we have now seen that the Medicare viability, the financial viability of Medicare has been extended by nearly a decade as a result of the Affordable Care Act and the kind of policies that were built in it—for example, free preventative care.

I have already talked about young adults being able to stay, and that is 2.3 million young adults.

Lives saved from reductions in hospital-acquired conditions. Eighty-seven thousand Americans are alive today because of better healthcare in the hospitals.

Public satisfaction. Eighty-two percent of the consumers in the marketplace plans or newly insured under Medicare due to the ACA, the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, have expressed satisfaction with their coverages.

Tax credits. Seven in 10 consumers in the marketplace got coverage through their tax credits.

I already talked about preexisting conditions.

Mental health and maternity care. Family values, well, we hear that all

the time here on the floor. Family values, this is a family value. This is a family value, yes. And the Affordable Care Act is a family value because maternity coverage is guaranteed. The most basic element of family, babies are now covered.

Maternity care is now guaranteed coverage under the Affordable Care Act. And from the moment that baby is born, through their life under the Affordable Care Act, they have a guaranteed coverage, regardless of any illness that they may have at birth.

I can give you story after story that I found when I was an insurance commissioner in California. The family had coverage. The family actually had maternity coverage. The baby is born with a serious defect of some sort. There was no coverage for that baby because of a preexisting condition from the very moment of birth. That is not the case any longer in America as a result of the Affordable Care Act.

We can go on and on, and probably we ought to. We have heard a lot. I am just going to keep this up here to remind all of us about a test of what good public policy can and should be.

There has been a lot of talk now about the collapse of the insurance market. We have heard the President talk about the collapse of the insurance market. Any time he brings up the issue of the repeal of ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, he always prefaces it or follows his comments with: The insurance market is imploding. It is collapsing.

We have heard that discussion here on the floor from the leaders of the majority party. The Affordable Care Act is collapsing. The insurance markets are collapsing. Oh, my, my. Interesting.

Let's see, this is the 10th of July. A report was issued by The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation—not a liberal organization, not a conservative organization, but one of the best-known research organizations on healthcare in America. The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation issued a report on July 10, 2017, by Cynthia Cox and Larry Levitt. I won't read it all to you, but I will read the discussion point.

Early results from 2017 suggest the individual market is stabilizing and insurers in this market are regaining profitability. Insurance financial results show no signs of a market collapse. Hello. Anybody listening?

Early results from 2017 suggest the individual market is stabilizing and insurers in this market are regaining profitability. Insurer financial results show no sign of market collapse.

First quarter premium and claims data from 2017. First quarter premium and claims data—this is from the insurance companies—from 2017 support the notion that 2017 premium increases were necessary as a one-time market correction to adjust for a sicker than expected risk pool.

Although individual market enrollees appear, on average, to be sicker

than the market pre-ACA, data on hospitalization in this market suggests that the risk pool is stable, on average, and not getting progressively sicker, as of early 2017.

Some insurers have exited the market in recent years, but others have successfully expanded their footprints, as would be expected in a competitive market.

Now the caveats. While the market, on average, is stabilizing, there remain some areas of the country that are more fragile. In addition—and here is the important point for any policymaker in Washington, D.C., from the President to the rest of us. In addition, policy uncertainty has the potential to destabilize the individual market generally.

Mixed signals from the administration and Congress as to whether cost-sharing subsidies under the Affordable Care Act and cost-sharing reduction payments will continue, or whether the individual mandate will be enforced, have led some insurers to leave the market or request larger premium increases than they would otherwise.

Few parts of the country may now be at risk of having no insurers. If you don't mind, I would like to go back over that again. Mixed signals from the administration—hello, President Trump and Congress. Hello, my colleagues—who have voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act, mixed signals from the administration and Congress as to whether cost-sharing subsidy payments will continue, or whether the individual mandate will be enforced, have led some insurers to leave the market or request larger premium increases than they would otherwise.

So who is responsible for the collapse? Well, we can do some finger-pointing, but then I would be admonishing—Mr. Speaker, I should do some finger-pointing, but I am not going to do it right now.

I am going to go back here. "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much."

Okay. Let's look at the repeal. Let's judge the repeal based on that criteria. Maybe you don't believe Franklin Delano Roosevelt was correct, but maybe we ought to just see what we are talking about here.

The repeal of the Affordable Care Act, the legislation that passed this House, the tax provisions in the Affordable Care Act, it is somewhere north of a \$700 billion to \$800 billion reduction in taxes. That is a lot of tax reduction. That was in the legislation.

I have argued repeatedly here on the floor and other places that it is the largest single transfer of wealth from the poor and the middle class to the super wealthy. That argument is factual because, what are the benefits? Who wins in the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, the poor, or the 22 million to 24 million people who will lose their insurance as a result of the repeal of the Affordable Care Act? That was in the House bill.

In the Senate bill, they are talking about similar numbers, 23 million, 24 million, 25 million people. That is a lot of Americans who are going to lose their insurance and are going to be personally, physically harmed as a result of the repeal.

So who benefits? The other side of this piece of legislation is one of the largest tax reductions ever—not for the poor, small for the middle class, but oh, my, for the wealthy, the top 1 percent of Americans—excuse me—the top one-tenth of 1 percent of Americans would have their taxes cut, on average, by \$197,490 per year. That is the top one-tenth of 1 percent.

How about the top 100 wealthy families in America, five of whom are in this administration, the super wealthy, what does it mean to them? \$4 million to \$6 million a year reduction, on average, in their taxes. The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much.

Need I stand here on the floor for hours driving home the point that the repeal of the Affordable Care Act is more than a taking away of healthcare benefits in which, if we were to believe the Senate and the Senate bill were to become law, 18 million Americans next year would lose their health insurance, and then beyond, another 5 million Americans in the years ahead.

It is a test of our progress. It is whether we provide enough for those who have too little. It is pretty easy, a pretty easy criteria when applied against the repeal. Are we providing anything for them? No, you are taking away their healthcare, their health insurance, and, undoubtedly, their health and their lives. It doesn't meet this test at all.

On the tax side, oh, my, the bottom 80 percent of taxpayers in this Nation would receive the awesome, extraordinary benefit of a reduction of \$160 a year in their taxes.

□ 2000

That is what our Republicans have offered us with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act. Eighty percent of American taxpayers would receive the awesome, extraordinary benefit of a \$160 annual reduction in their taxes, while the superwealthy, the top 100 families, a \$4 million to \$6 million annual reduction, and the top one-tenth of 1 percent of Americans—wealthy—would receive a \$197,490 reduction, on average.

Mr. Roosevelt, President Roosevelt, laid out a clear criteria.

So where are we? Where are we? We have the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation report yesterday. The insurance market is not collapsing, and where it is is the result of what this administration and Congress are doing. They are destabilizing the market. That is what is happening. That is why these insurers are leaving certain communities and certain States because they simply do not know what is going to happen.

Insurance companies have to plan now—actually, a month or two ago—

for the insurance policy that they will be selling in the fall and in the early winter, October, November, December, for the next year, the 2018 year. And they do not know because of what this Congress is doing; they don't know how to price, and therefore market instability is the result.

There is more to it than that. Under the law today, the Federal Government is supposed to be providing money for the exchanges. That money has been withheld under this administration in numerous ways, actively and proactively taking steps to undermine the insurance market so, presumably, they can say: "Oh, my, it is collapsing."

Well, if it is, it is the President's fault, and it is the fault of this Congress in passing such legislation.

Now, I hear a lot of talk, and it is correct, a lot of discussion about what we can do together. Let's not fight. Let's work together. Let's improve the Affordable Care Act. We ought to, and we can. There are many ways it can be done.

So what can we do?

Well, we could immediately end the efforts to destabilize the market. That would be a good start, wouldn't it? All that takes is an end to this effort to repeal and, rather, to do what the President asked us to do, and that is to work together as he drives forward policies that destabilize the market as he continually talks about repeal. But he also says, "Let's work together." I agree with him. Let's work together. I ask the President to please stop his efforts to destabilize the market.

So what can we do?

How about if we allow the Federal Government to negotiate the price of drugs? We can't do it now, but what if we did? Would that help stabilize the market? It would certainly help reduce the cost. That is not a bad idea. So idea one. Let's allow the Federal and State governments to negotiate the price of prescription drugs and allow individuals to buy certain medications in Canada, for example, which they cannot, now, legally do.

We might think about expanding programs that are proven to enhance quality and reduce costs, such as streamlining care coordination. Coordinate the care and medical services that an individual has, particularly for those with chronic conditions, where most of the healthcare dollars are spent. It has been proven.

There are programs out there, pilot programs, and some are more permanent, that allow for coordination of benefits—that is, services—for those who have chronic illnesses. Part of that is found in the current Affordable Care Act. It is being done. It needs to be expanded.

And we can dramatically improve the care and the health of individuals by coordinating their care, making sure, for example, that people with diabetes are able to get the drugs, get the treatment, work on their healthcare, work

on the food they eat, and work on exercises, coordinate all of that. If you want to drive down the cost of healthcare, take the six chronic illnesses and coordinate the care. Keep people healthy. Keep them out of the hospital by being healthy. We can do that. We do, but not everywhere.

Allow States greater flexibility in administering the Medicaid program. Our Republican colleagues talk about this. We should do it. I am in favor of it.

I know from my experience as insurance commissioner in California that there are many things that can be done by the States as they deal with the peculiar and individual circumstances of the citizens of their State in altering the Medicaid program so that it can meet the needs of the State. Let's do it, but not with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act and stripping out of the program billions upon billions of dollars so there really is no money to do anything. That is flexibility in the Medicaid program.

We have a national health insurance exchange program. It is there, but it has been reined in. It has not been allowed to grow as it could by the actions of Congress. Since the Republicans took control of Congress, they have withheld, they have reined in, the national health insurance exchange program. This is in States that refused to establish their own exchanges. Individuals can then go to the national exchange. But they don't even know it is there because the advertising for the national exchange has been eliminated. So we can do that. It is pretty simple.

Hey, folks across America, you don't have a State exchange? You can come to the national exchange. You haven't heard about it? I am not surprised because there is no advertising. There is no knowledge available to individuals. It is a pretty simple thing we can do. As that exchange grows, we begin to spread the risk across a wider population.

In the early version of the Affordable Care Act here in the House of Representatives, we passed and I voted for what was known as the public option, a national public insurance option. The Senate removed it—mostly Republicans, but some Democrats didn't think that was a good idea. I thought it was a good idea in 2009 when the issue came before us because I saw an advantage in a national insurance program.

So there are five things that we can do right there, and there are many, many more.

When the repeal of the Affordable Care Act passed through this House on the floor, my Democratic colleagues offered 22 amendments to improve the Affordable Care Act, to improve ObamaCare. They were all rejected. So much for working together.

But let me make a baseline statement: Don't repeal the Affordable Care Act; improve the Affordable Care Act. If you are determined to repeal the Affordable Care Act, there is not much

we can work with. That is why I took the time to talk about the Americans that are now covered, the seniors that now have drug coverages, the end of discrimination based upon preexisting conditions. That is why I talked about those things.

In a repeal—and the President called for a flat-out repeal—that is gone. It is gone. If you want to do that, don't count on me. I won't be there. But if you want to take the Affordable Care Act and if you want to deal with the problems that we know are there, then let's work together.

I just laid out five things. There are 17 more that have been suggested by my Democratic colleagues. We can improve the well-being of Americans. We can help those people.

As for my wife's hairdresser, I don't know if she is going to get pregnant because she doesn't know if she is going to continue to have coverage. For that farmer, that woman who is running her own family farm, she doesn't know either. There are 23 million Americans who are in that position—23, and quite possibly more—who don't know if a year from now, 2 years from now, they will have health insurance.

So, President Roosevelt: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

HONORING MR. CLARENCE GOODEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the great community stewardship of Mr. Clarence Gooden, recently retired president of the CSX Railroad.

In 2003, Mr. Speaker, I was newly elected sheriff of the city of Jacksonville, Florida, and my wife, Pat, and I were invited to a Christmas dinner hosted by Mr. Clarence Gooden and his wife, Corkie.

It was during my discussions surrounding my new position as sheriff that I shared with Clarence and his wife how drug dealers had taken over Mallison Park, which in years past was actually the crown jewel of parks in the city of Jacksonville. I explained to them how the park manager had been severely battered by drug dealers, and though we had made several arrests in the park, the dealers continued to return, and the children were being denied the use of this great park.

Mr. Speaker, I also shared with him a campaign promise that I had made to help at-risk youth through an expansion of an intervention program called the Police Athletic League into areas such as Mallison Park, which would offer at-risk youth sports programs,

after-school tutoring, food, and personal hygiene, all provided by specialized officers trained in intervention.

Clarence asked me the cost of such an expansion, and I informed him it would be close to \$100,000 to refurbish and move programs into Mallison Park. He immediately responded, Mr. Speaker, that he would raise those funds by April. I reminded him it was already the end of December, but he and Corkie assured me that they would meet an April deadline.

Incredibly, Clarence devised a plan for what became known as the CSX Charity Train Ride, which entailed a fundraiser that gave contributors an amazing train ride with dinner and entertainment. The event was a first-class success, and Clarence had raised all the funds necessary to refurbish Mallison Park and move the Police Athletic League into those new facilities. Their efforts led to an over 40 percent drop in violent crime within a 1-mile radius of Mallison Park.

Over the years, the CSX Charity Train Ride grew into one of the largest single charity events in northeast Florida, and it continued to add additional charity recipients every year.

Mr. Speaker, Clarence and Corkie, with the assistance of Mrs. Rosemary Thigpen, have raised, to date, over \$4 million for over 10 local charities. Last year alone, they raised over \$400,000 for charities, including Angelwood, the Police Athletic League, and the American Heart Association, just to name a few. Not only does he have a huge heart for the community, but he never lost his concern for others as he worked his way up throughout his career.

Mr. Speaker, Clarence actually began as a laborer at Seaboard Coastline Railroad before it became CSX, and he worked his way up the ranks to the president's office of a tier one railroad. He recently retired from CSX, and I know he will continue to have passion for others.

I appreciate his dedication to the citizens of northeast Florida. I am sure I echo the thoughts of all when I wish him and Corkie continued good health and happiness in both his retirement and all of their future endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to seeing Mr. Gooden soon and presenting him with this coin as a token of the tremendous appreciation from all of those in the Fourth District whose lives Mr. Gooden, Mrs. Gooden, and CSX have touched.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2015

HEALTHCARE ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been interesting to hear all the rhet-

oric about Republican efforts that a majority of Americans have wanted us to take. Going back to even before ObamaCare was passed, the majority of Americans didn't want ObamaCare passed.

I have been amazed at some of the rhetoric from across the aisle, I think from the former Speaker, who said something about how open their process was.

Really?

Anyway, I know sometimes our memories aren't what they once were. That was not a terribly open process. I believe the Speaker back then said: We don't need any Republican vote and we don't want your input. Basically those were the words I recall.

People were promised over and over again by the President of the United States that if you like your insurance, you can keep your insurance. On at least one occasion he even said the word "period," there are no exceptions. If you like your insurance, you can keep your insurance.

So it was quite disappointing. Some of us knew this was a disastrous bill. I did read it. I didn't have to wait until Speaker PELOSI passed it to find out what was in it. I read it and I knew it was going to be a disaster.

Then, after it passed, we ultimately find out that they knew well in advance that if you liked your insurance, there was a very good chance you would not be able to keep your insurance, period. It wasn't true. All those, including the President, went around saying: If you like your insurance, you can keep it. According to statements after the fact by people involved, yes, they talked about it and they knew people were going to lose their insurance. They are going to lose their doctor, they are going to lose their healthcare provider, but we can't say those things and still pass this bill. We can't let that get out there.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want people to remember how this disastrous legislation ever came about in the first place, and how, going against the will of the American people to pass the disastrous bill—around 2,500 pages is what my two volumes came to—but people knew it was going to do lot of damage to people's health and their lives. As we know, when you cannot get the healthcare you need or the lifesaving healthcare you have been getting, you no longer live.

It is amazing now, after ObamaCare passed 7 years, to find out things about the knowing design of ObamaCare. They knew that insurance companies, under ObamaCare, were given incentives not to have the best people to treat cancer, the best cancer healthcare providers, the best cancer lifesavers in the network.

They had incentives under ObamaCare to not include the best physicians and hospitals that will save the lives of people who have cancer; don't include the best healthcare providers that will help those save their

lives, or at least prolong the lives of those with AIDS; don't include in your insurance coverage the best healthcare providers for those with heart problems.

If you don't include the best healthcare providers for cancer, AIDS, heart problems, or whatever it is, then people who are going to cost you a lot of money will not likely choose your insurance.

It was all part of the design to implode healthcare in America, destroy the broken system we had so that people would eventually throw up their hands and say: Well, I didn't originally want healthcare, but surely anything will be better than what we have.

Apparently, from the beginning, the intention was to set it up to give Big Pharma, to give some insurance companies, basically, not only incentives, but mandates that would force their prices ever upward. As Big Pharma knew, they were going to make profits like they had never made in their history.

As I have told some of the Representatives before, when they signed onto ObamaCare, they basically signed your own death warrant. Yes, you will make tens, maybe hundreds of billions more than you have in the past, but eventually it will lead to your industry being controlled by the government in such a way that you will be like pharmaceutical companies in Third World countries where they are allowed to collect the costs of production and maybe a small percentage above that, which means there are no new life-saving, life-enhancing drugs being produced in countries like that. Eventually, down the road, ObamaCare would destroy the incentives to create new lifesaving drugs and it would be the end of this incredible run of decades of the most incredible advances in medicine in the history of the world.

Some medical historians say that maybe 100 years or so ago, protocols around the time of World War I were the line of demarcation in our history. Somewhere around the early 20th century, early 1900s, there was a point where—before that point in time, if you went to a doctor, your odds were better of getting worse. If you go to a doctor seeking help for a healthcare problem, the odds were you would get worse. On the other side of that line, in the early 1900s, was a point that if you went to a doctor for healthcare help, your odds of getting well were better than of getting worse.

So it is pretty remarkable, if those historians are right, that for the thousands of years of recorded history, it is only the last 100 years where you had a chance of getting better if you sought medical help than of getting worse if you got medical help.

Look at what has happened since then. It is just incredible, especially since the 1950s. I would submit that the Founders' vision in creating copyright and patent protection for intellectual creations and thought helped drive

those developments in healthcare. It made a lot of people wealthy. But there is nothing like real incentive, more luxury, more freedom, more enjoyment because of the huge rewards of great intellectual creations. Healthcare had just become incredible.

I began to notice after I got to Congress that my friends across the aisle were completely skewing the massive difference between health insurance and healthcare. Health insurance was an even newer thing to most Americans. For healthcare—as we say, maybe the historians are right—it is around 100 years ago that, for the first time, you had a better chance of getting better than you had of getting worse after seeking a doctor's help. But wow, the advances, the progress that was made.

The more the government interferes and dictates who gets what, the more rationed care you get, the less advances in healthcare, the less incentives there are to create lifesaving, life-enhancing medications. When government is the most powerful player in healthcare, you will always end up with rationed healthcare.

Some point to the situation with the small child, Charlie Gard, in the U.K. They say that is what happens when you have bureaucrats deciding who gets to live and who has to die. But the more appropriate analysis, I think, is they are not actually deciding so much the ultimate conclusion of who gets to live and who has to die, but what they are really doing to get there is deciding, rationing, which lives, in the opinion of government bureaucrats, are more important or may be more helpful to the socialist movement, to the bureaucratic entrenchment than someone else.

If you are perceived by the government bureaucracy or the government bureaucrats, the D.C. bureaucrats as being a threat to more government—more powerful government, more control of the individual, if you are a threat to those things, then you can pretty well be assured that when your situation is analyzed by the bureaucrats, you are not going to be eligible for the lifesaving medications and you are not going to be eligible for the hip replacement because we looked at your age and you have had a nice life and it is time to give it up. We don't have enough for everybody to have everything we want, so we in Washington will decide who gets to live and who gets to die. Actually, we decide who gets what treatment.

In the case of Charlie Gard, it is not a lack of concern about life; it is just in the opinion of the bureaucrats, where it always goes with socialized medicine. We only have limited government resources, therefore, we have to be careful whom we help. In their opinion, Charlie Gard may not make it.

□ 2030

The way Americans, a majority of Americans, at least, used to feel was every life is worth trying to protect. Of

course, along came *Roe v. Wade* and made clear only those lives are worthy of protecting if a mother wants to protect them.

We even had people in the previous administration that had voted, made the pronouncement through their actions and votes, statements, that even if a child is born alive after an attempted abortion, in the opinion of those individuals, like our former President, you still should be able to kill the child even if the child is born alive because the mother wanted the child aborted, so go ahead and kill the child.

I am grateful for all the stalwarts over the years, but I believe we have seen a change in that philosophy in the realization, like with the heartbeat bill, that says, in essence, if a child has a heartbeat, they are a living person and may not be aborted.

So it is an interesting time here in America, but it has now resulted in a lot of rhetoric that is really outrageous. You know, I have said for years here on this floor that, with all the allegations, statements, verbal wars that have gone on across the aisle, you know, we know that no one on the Democratic side wants to harm people, wants people hurt. We don't question their motives, and yet, as I am in my office hearing friends across the aisle—okay, I am using the term "friends" loosely—but hearing them use terms about how we want people to die. We have come to a sad place in our history.

This story, June 30, from FOX News, was reporting on statements made by some individuals. This quote said—this is from Massachusetts Senator ELIZABETH WARREN: "These Medicaid cuts are blood money. People will die. Let's be very clear: Senate Republicans are paying for tax cuts for the wealthy with American lives."

Senator BERNIE SANDERS appeared on NBC's "Meet the Press" to predict thousands would die if a projected 23 million drop or lose their insurance. And Senator SANDERS accused Republicans of trading healthcare for tax breaks to the rich: "Is this what America is supposed to be about, taking away health insurance from kids with disabilities, from people with cancer in order to give tax breaks to the billionaires?"

"Let us be clear, and this is not trying to be overly dramatic: Thousands of people will die if the Republican healthcare bill becomes law."

Well, you want to fact-check that, of course. If the Republicans' healthcare bill, whatever it says in the Senate, is passed, thousands of people will die. If the bill is not passed, thousands of people will die. So I guess we can't say it is not true. People are going to die whether it passes or not, but the implication is that Republicans, through their efforts, are going to kill people.

What I would just like is an acknowledgment from our friends across the aisle, like Senator SANDERS, that there

have been people since ObamaCare has passed who lost their insurance, lost their healthcare provider, didn't get the treatments they needed, their way of life was harmed; and there are bound to have been a lot of people who died sooner than they would have earlier if the President's words had not been hollow that, if you like your insurance, you can keep your insurance, and if ObamaCare had not rewarded insurance companies for not including places like MD Anderson, treating for cancer, or good healthcare providers.

Obviously, if they have the best healthcare providers for cancer, for these other life-ending diseases, then people will use their insurance, drive up the cost; so it really created an incentive for insurance companies not to get the best end-of-life treaters in their network. To their credit, some have, but many haven't. So it has been amazing.

Here is other rhetoric. The former Senator, Hillary Clinton, said: "Forget death panels. If Republicans pass this bill, they're the death party."

I mean, maybe that is one of the reasons she didn't win. I mean, that is just an outrageous thing to say.

This article goes on to say: "Some Democrats traveled the country to ring the alarm. Colorado Governor John Hickenlooper came to Washington to lobby against the measure, which he said was immoral and would lead to 100,000 deaths by 2026."

Now, there is this liberal group, apparently, Center for American Progress, liberal think tank—I don't know what their tank is full of, but it is obviously more socialistic thinking. But according to this liberal group, the Center of American Progress, if 23 million fewer people have health insurance, then the coverage losses from the Senate bill would result in 27,700 additional deaths in 2026 and 217,000 over the decade.

Well, isn't that interesting. There is nothing that they can adequately point to as a factual basis. Any citing of CBO, whose margin of error on ObamaCare could have been anywhere from plus or minus 200 to 400 percent—CBO is not a source that should ever be cited with a straight face. They just shouldn't be.

I agree with my friend, Dr. Arthur Laffer, that when it comes to tax reform, we just need to forget CBO. They don't know "sic 'em" from "come here." They explain, yes, they create these models, so they don't really come up with a score. They create models that provide us the scores: garbage in, garbage out.

So it has just gotten to be a sad state of affairs because people are hurting across America. And I know there is apparently 25 percent in my district. I have heard them. I understand they want to keep ObamaCare. They want to move towards socialism. They like the government having so much control over their lives. Just go ahead and check them into an Orwellian center

and let them enjoy Big Brother taking care of them.

But I do represent their best interests, and I think the 75 percent in my district are right about what will be best, that ObamaCare needs to be repealed. We need to get relationships back between a patient and a doctor without an insurance company or a government in between them—except for very rare occasions—as it once was. It used to be the government didn't have anything to say much at all about that other than having the FDA, things like that. But insurance companies came along, and they were only for catastrophic problems, so we still had complete control of our healthcare.

I do appreciate, greatly appreciate, House Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI referencing the need to honor God. That means a lot to me. Her statement that to minister to the needs of God's creation is an act of worship, to ignore those needs is to dishonor the God who made us, but if the government is big and strong enough to say who gets healthcare and who doesn't, who gets treatment, who gets the lifesaving care and who doesn't, then that is to put government in the place of God, and nothing dishonors God more than to have any person or any entity that believes it is the substitute for God.

The United States Government is not a substitute for God. Without God's blessing, as our Founders repeatedly made clear, we wouldn't have even the freedom we have today.

Joseph Schmitz, on July 5, wrote a terrific article, and it is absolutely worth every Republican taking note of. I would encourage my friends across the aisle to take note of it, but I understand their positions. They cannot participate in the repeal of ObamaCare because they staked the majority—well, they staked future socialism on this bill.

Mr. Schmitz says: "In early 2016, Congress passed H.R. 3762, a law that would have repealed most of ObamaCare. On January 8, 2016, Obama vetoed that would-be ObamaCare Repeal Act.

"240 years earlier, Congress declared 'to a candid world' that, 'The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States.' Among other usurpations specified in the Declaration of Independence, 'He'—talking about the king—"has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance.'

"Our 1776 Declaration of Independence concluded, 'We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress, assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world'—that is not the government. That is appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world—"for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name and by authority of the good peo-

ple of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare that these United Colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent states; . . . and for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.'

"In July 2017, Congress should likewise acknowledge the 'swarms of officers' harassing our good people under the guise of ObamaCare and reenact the 2016 ObamaCare Repeal Act.

"Note well below the revenue-raising nature of the ObamaCare repeal sections of H.R. 3762, keeping in mind that ObamaCare originated in 2009 as the 'Senate Health Care bill,' and the Constitution provides that, 'All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.'" That is Article I, section 7, clause 1.

□ 2045

And he goes on for quite some time to cite all the different sections in ObamaCare that actually make it a revenue-raising bill. Section 204 has the individual mandate mandating people have to pay money and buy something; section 205, an employer mandate mandating that they must pay a massive tax like the individual or pay for insurance, buy a product. For the first time in American history, citizens are required to buy a product, employers are ordered to buy a product. Section 206, Federal payments to the States; section 209, repeal of the tax on employee health insurance premiums and health plan benefits; section 210, repeal of the tax on over-the-counter medications.

I am sorry. These are the names of the sections in the House bill. Those were not in ObamaCare. These are the provisions in the House bill that would repeal all these taxes, as Chief Justice Roberts called them.

So these are all good sections, is what Joe Schmitz is pointing out, individual mandate, employer mandate, getting rid of those, Federal payments to States. It is just taking out a repeal of the employee tax. So there we go. It is eliminating so much of the taxes on individuals, repeal of the tax on over-the-counter medications.

This was the Democrats, without a single Republican vote, who passed this legislation, ObamaCare, the ACA. They put a tax on over-the-counter medications, they put a tax on employee health insurance premiums and a tax on health plan benefits, and they put a tax on health savings accounts. They had already paid money on that that went in it, but anyway.

So the Republican bill that President Obama vetoed, it would repeal limitations on contributions to flexible spending accounts. You can put as much as you want in there. It would repeal the tax on prescription medication. ObamaCare actually put a tax on your precious prescription medications that are saving people's lives.

Anybody who would have the gall after voting for all these taxes put on the backs of poor people who can't even hardly afford their prescriptions as they are, and, yes, they have been skyrocketing under ObamaCare, and to say that Republicans are trying to harm people and dishonor God, for Heaven's sake, read your own bill.

They put a tax on medical devices. Senior citizens who had to have help moving or walking, you got to pay a tax on that, and we don't care if you can't afford the tax and you can't move around anymore. We are the government.

That was the ACA, ObamaCare, that put that tax in place, and another health insurance tax in the bill, and it eliminated the deduction for expenses allocatable to Medicare part D subsidies. It placed a tax called a chronic care tax, there was a Medicare tax increase, there was a tanning tax, there was a net investment tax, all kinds of taxes in ObamaCare. They hammered the American people.

We were promised—President Obama stood right there and promised no money would pay for abortions under his healthcare bill, under the healthcare bill they were going to pass. That is what he said. He said no people illegally in the United States were going to get their healthcare on the backs of people in America legally. Both of those were not true. It turns out Joe Wilson was prescient.

It is time to wake up. We were sent back into the majority because ObamaCare was passed, and we are going to be sent back in the minority, appropriately, if we don't repeal it.

President Trump has made clear in a recent tweet: Look, if you guys can't pass the replacement now, at least pass the repeal, then we can start moving together on a replacement.

Surely the Democrats will want to come and not be so obstructionist once their precious ObamaCare has been struck down; then maybe they will actually work with us to create a better system, but it is time to wake up, it is time to repeal ObamaCare.

Now, I want to touch on one other subject, Mr. Speaker, and that is involving all this mess, these allegations about Russia.

It was not Donald J. Trump nor any Republican who told the Russians—the Russian leaders, actually: I will have a lot more flexibility after the election.

That can only mean one thing: I am going to give away a lot more of America's strength, helping you out in Russia. As you are trying to get stronger, I am going to give away a lot more of our strength, maybe our edge over your military. I will have more ability to give that away after I am elected to a second term. Tell Vladimir.

It was not a Republican, certainly not anyone associated with Donald Trump, who went to Russia with a supposed reset button, couldn't get the translation right, but wanting to reset the relationship.

And for those who didn't follow history well back then, the reason there was a strain in the relationship between the United States and Russia was because George W. Bush as President of the United States stood on principle, and when the country of Russia, under Putin, attacked Georgia, President Bush, appropriately, was outraged, and he pushed for sanctions to let Russia know that the United States does not approve of Russia attacking sovereign countries.

So the message that President Obama and Hillary Clinton wanted to get across to Putin and the Russians was, with a wink and lots of pats and happy times: Look, George W. Bush as President, we think, overreacted when you attacked Georgia, you know. So we want to let you know we want a reset button, because under President Obama and me, Hillary Clinton, we are not going to overreact when you attack neighboring sovereign countries. We are okay with that, see, and we want things reset. We are not going to get upset like Bush did when you attacked a neighboring country.

That is the message that came across very loud and clear to Putin and those around him.

I would like to think I learned during my summer as an exchange student in the Soviet Union a little bit about the way a lot of Russians think. I get surprised when people say: It is so hard to read Putin. No, it is not. The man was part of the KGB. He wants the glory days of the old Soviet Union back even though they were built on a skeleton that could never maintain the weight that such a Socialist country was putting on that frame.

So then we find out here, this was back in January, January 11, 2017, an article in Politico of all places, surprise, surprise, by Kenneth P. Vogel and David Stern, it says: "Ukrainian government officials tried to help Hillary Clinton and undermine Trump by publicly questioning his fitness for office. They also disseminated documents implicating a top Trump aide in corruption and suggested they were investigating the matter, only to back away after the election. And they helped Clinton's allies research damaging information on Trump and his advisers, a Politico investigation found.

"A Ukrainian-American operative who was consulting for the Democratic National Committee met with top officials in the Ukrainian Embassy in Washington in an effort to expose ties between Trump, top campaign aide Paul Manafort and Russia, according to people with direct knowledge of the situation."

This is Politico reporting on the collusion between Hillary Clinton, her campaign, and the country of Ukraine to stop and defeat Trump.

Now, where has the Politico reporting on this issue been since January? I appreciate them pointing this out back in January, but apparently at this

point back in January, Politico had not yet gotten the word from their friends on the Democratic side of the aisle: hey, hey, kind of soft-pedal that stuff where we colluded with the Ukrainians to try to take Trump out, because we are going to make that a big allegation about Trump and the Russians, so kind of back off that. Let's take the spotlight off that one.

The article goes on: "The Ukrainian efforts had an impact in the race, helping to force Manafort's resignation and advancing the narrative that Trump's campaign was deeply connected to Ukraine's foe to the east, Russia. But they were far less concerted or centrally directed than Russia's alleged hacking and dissemination of Democratic emails.

"Russia's effort was personally directed by Russian President Vladimir Putin. . . ."

So they go on and try to do what they can to help, you know, salvage some respect for the Democrats here. There is little evidence of such a top-down effort by Ukraine, but the fact is Ukraine did collude with Hillary Clinton's campaign, and they were successful in helping the Trump campaign, Manafort had to be fired, and they are still trying to create clouds surrounding that. But anyway, how about that?

Well, it leads to one conclusion, and that is that it is part of the evidence that we have got to have an independent counsel, and I don't mean Robert Mueller. I am talking about an independent counsel, not one that is bosom buddies with Comey; and not one that can't stand Trump; and not one that is going to run out, not hire any Republicans for his staff who love Trump, but just hire people who can't stand him and wanted Hillary elected.

This is a guy who has been vindictive, who has worked closely with Comey in the past, and he is in no position whatsoever to judge anything about James Comey.

If you go back and look at what is required under 28 CFR 45.2, it provides that a Department of Justice attorney should not participate in investigations that may involve entities or individuals with whom the attorney has a political or personal relationship.

Mueller and Comey are buddies. They have closely consulted on so many things.

□ 2100

For example, this story from June 7, 2017, by Josh Siegel, says:

"Former FBI Director Jim Comey 'closely coordinated' with Special Counsel Robert Mueller before his planned testimony before the Senate Intelligence Committee about his interactions with President Trump.

"FOX News reported a source close to Comey said the former FBI Director consulted with Mueller about how to approach Thursday's Senate Intelligence Committee hearing. The Department of Justice appointed Mueller

special counsel to lead the investigation of Russia's involvement in the 2016 election, and any possible collusion with the Trump campaign. Mueller and Comey were longtime colleagues at the Justice Department, and legal experts say it would not be unusual for a special counsel to be in contact with somebody who is a party to its investigation."

Mueller and Comey were longtime colleagues at the Justice Department.

Well, anyway, there needs to be an independent counsel who will investigate the goings-on between Robert Mueller and James Comey with the recent revelations about Comey's very apparent release of classified information.

Bob Mueller is not in a position to judge him. And a great piece of evidence that Robert Mueller is not fit to be the special counsel investigating this matter is the fact that he didn't recuse himself because of his close relationship with Comey, and how Comey is a critical witness in what he accuses Trump of, which doesn't seem to really be a crime.

But, based on Comey's testimony before the Senate, it bears going back and looking at a normal FBI employment agreement that says: I will surrender upon demand by the FBI or upon my separation from the FBI all materials containing FBI information in my possession.

They also have a breach of contract case there because the FBI Director carried stuff with him, that he prepared on his government time with his government equipment, saved with his government equipment, and passed on, apparently, with his government equipment, that appears to have been classified, according to the new releases coming out now.

If you look at Comey's conduct in the past, as this article from Mollie Hemingway on June 12, 2017, pointed out, he had pressured John Ashcroft to recuse himself from the responsibility of investigating the supposed, the alleged, leak of Valerie Plame's identity. It turns out the prosecutor knew on day one who it was—Richard Armitage—but he wasn't honest enough to say: "We know. I don't need to spend millions and millions of dollars of government tax dollars and waste thousands and thousands of hours investigating. We know the answer."

No, no, no. This was Comey's dear friend, Patrick Fitzgerald—not just a close personal friend, but godfather to one of his children—and Comey gave the role of special counsel into that leak on Valerie Plame's identity. It was Comey who gave that to Patrick Fitzgerald, his close friend.

What a travesty that turned out to be. That was a fraud upon the American Government by Patrick Fitzgerald. He knew on day one the answer to his investigation, but he wanted a scalp, so he wasted a tremendous amount of time trying to get one. A 3-year investigation.

And what did he end up doing?

Fitzgerald ended up prosecuting "Scooter Libby for"—as she says—"wait for it, obstruction of justice. Comey was unconcerned about the jailing of journalists and never threatened to resign over this infringement on First Amendment freedoms."

So, since Mueller did not have the moral sense to recuse himself when he was offered this special counsel job because of his close personal relationship with James Comey and who he has hired since then, it is very clear, the President is not going to be able to fire him, because there would be such screaming about the Saturday Night Massacre. Mueller knew that, and this is part of his vindictiveness. When it became clear from Comey's testimony that there was no conclusion with Russia by President Trump, then he leaks out that: Oh, I am investigating the President for obstruction of justice.

Why would he do that?

Because by leaking out that he was now investigating the President—if the President fired him after he leaks out that he is investigating the President, then you would have the allegations of the Saturday Night Massacre and all this kind of stuff.

So the only way forward is the appointment by President Donald Trump of an independent counsel that is truly independent.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need someone who has been contributing to Hillary Clinton or to Barack Obama or to any major Democrat or to any major Republican. We need somebody that is going to be a fair arbiter in this pursuit of justice so that he can investigate Mueller fairly and impartially. And the relationship, whether Comey and Mueller consulted, as they did on so many things, like his Senate testimony, about some of the things—well, like the leak that Comey testified to that appears, potentially, to have been a crime.

We need to know what Mueller knew. Obviously, Robert Mueller is not going to resign, so the President couldn't very well fire him. But we have got to get to the bottom and find out what really happened so that justice is done.

The projecting by one group of people on the Republican Party conduct they engaged in and projecting it on the Republican Party as if it was they that did what this group did, it is time to have all this investigated. We are not going to get it with Mueller, a dear friend of Comey. It is time to have a true independent counsel.

The only one way we can do that appropriately is if President Trump finds somebody truly independent, truly not a political animal, who can investigate. And that is not Rosenstein, that is for sure, as well. Then we can get to the bottom and see that justice is done.

So here is our work. Let's stay here and work until we get ObamaCare repealed, tax reform passed and signed into law, and let's encourage the President to appoint independent counsel so

that we can finally see justice in this case, where currently all we have is what one friend referred to as a big fraternity party among the Muellers and Comeys and their buddies in that fraternity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 23, GAINING RESPONSIBILITY ON WATER ACT OF 2017

Mr. BYRNE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-212) on the resolution (H. Res. 431) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 23) to provide drought relief in the State of California, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

April 3, 2017:

H.J. Res. 69. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule of the Department of the Interior relating to "Non-Subsistence Take of Wildlife, and Public Participation and Closure Procedures, on National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska".

H.J. Res. 83. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Clarification of Employer's Continuing Obligation to Make and Maintain an Accurate Record of Each Recordable Injury and Illness".

H.R. 1228. An Act to provide for the appointment of members of the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance to replace members whose terms expire during 2017, and for other purposes.

April 13, 2017:

H.J. Res. 43. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule submitted by Secretary of Health and Human Services relating to compliance with title X requirements by project recipients in selecting subrecipients.

H.J. Res. 67. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by qualified State political subdivisions for non-governmental employees.

April 18, 2017:

H.R. 353. An Act to improve the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's weather research through a focused program of investment on affordable and attainable

advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to support substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, to expand commercial opportunities for the provision of weather data, and for other purposes.
April 28, 2017:

H.J. Res. 99. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes.

May 5, 2017:
H.R. 244. An Act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes.

May 8, 2017:
H.R. 534. An Act to require the Secretary of State to take such actions as may be necessary for the United States to rejoin the Bureau of International Expositions, and for other purposes.

May 16, 2017:
H.R. 274. An Act to provide for reimbursement for the use of modern travel services by Federal employees traveling on official Government business, and for other purposes.

May 17, 2017:
H.J. Res. 66. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by States for non-governmental employees.

June 6, 2017:
H.R. 366. An Act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in managing the Department's vehicle fleet, and for other purposes.

H.R. 375. An Act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 719 Church Street in Nashville, Tennessee as the "Fred D. Thompson Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

June 14, 2017:
H.R. 657. An Act to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend certain protections against prohibited personnel practices, and for other purposes.

June 30, 2017:
H.R. 1238. An Act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for Health Affairs responsible for coordinating the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security related to food, agriculture, and veterinary defense against terrorism, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

April 3, 2017:
S.J. Res. 34. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission relating to "Protecting the Privacy of Customers of Broadband and Other Telecommunications Services".

April 19, 2017:
S. 544. An Act to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to modify the termination date for the Veterans Choice Program, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 30. A joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Steve Case as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

S.J. Res. 35. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Michael Govan as a

citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

S.J. Res. 36. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Roger W. Ferguson as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

May 12, 2017:
S. 496. An Act to repeal the rule issued by the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration entitled "Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordination and Planning Area Reform".

June 2, 2017:
S. 419. An Act to require adequate reporting on the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program, and for other purposes.

S. 583. An Act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds to hire veterans as career law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

June 23, 2017:
S. 1094. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

June 27, 2017:
S. 1083. An Act to amend section 1214 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for stays during a period that the Merit Systems Protection Board lacks a quorum.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of tending to husband's health situation.

Mr. RASKIN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 12, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the

House of Representatives by the following Member of the 115th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

JIMMY GOMEZ, 34th District of California.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1899. A letter from the Chairman, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's annual report for CY 2016, pursuant to Sec. 5.64 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1900. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report titled "Fiscal Year 2016 Purchases From Foreign Entities", pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 8305; Public Law 104-201, Sec. 827 (as amended by Public Law 111-350, Sec. 3); (124 Stat. 3833) and Public Law 114-113, Sec. 8028(b); (129 Stat. 2357); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1901. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a selected acquisition report for the Navy/Marine Corps and the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1902. A letter from the Board Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's Report to the Congress on the Profitability of Credit Card Operations of Depository Institutions, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1637 note; Public Law 100-583, Sec. 8; (102 Stat. 2969); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1903. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's interim final rule — Revisions to Freedom of Information Act Regulations (RIN: 3038-AE57) received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1904. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Rosa's Law [Docket ID: ED-2017-OS-0051] (RIN: 1801-AA11) received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1905. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for the Division of Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Rosa's Law [Docket ID: ED-2017-OS-0051] (RIN: 1801-AA11) received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1906. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval and Designation of Areas; KY; Redesignation of the Kentucky Portion of the Cincinnati-Hamilton 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment [EPA-R04-OAR-2016-0601; FRL-9964-41-Region 4] received June 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1907. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Revised Format of 40 CFR Part 52 for Materials

Being Incorporated by Reference [EPA-R02-OAR-2016-0060; FRL-9955-06-Region 2] received June 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1908. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Rhode Island; Reasonably Available Control Technology for US Watercraft, LLC [EPA-R01-OAR-2017-0025; A-1-FRL-9964-26-Region 1] received June 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1909. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Revised Format for Materials Incorporated by Reference [EPA-R05-OAR-2016-0599; FRL-9963-76-Region 5] received June 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1910. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; FL: Revisions to New Source Review, Definitions and Small Business Assistance Programs [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0166; FRL-9964-35-Region 4] received June 28, 2017], pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1911. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; FL: Hillsborough and Nassau Areas; SO2 Attainment Demonstration [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0624 and EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0623; FRL-9964-39-Region 4] received June 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1912. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of Section 112(l) Authority for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Equivalency by Permit Provisions; National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Plating and Polishing Operations [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0209; FRL-9964-32-Region 4] received June 28, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1913. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — the Incentive Auction Task Force and Media Bureau Adopt Filing Requirements for the Transition Progress Report Form By Stations that are Not Eligible for Reimbursement From the TV Broadcast Relocation Fund [MB Docket No.: 16-306] [GN Docket No.: 12-268] received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1914. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting reports concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1915. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of

State, transmitting reports concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1916. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 16-73, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1917. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 16-70, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1918. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 16-69, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1919. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-130, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1920. A letter from the Vice President, Government Affairs and Corporate Communications, National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak), transmitting Amtrak's audited Consolidated Financial Statements for the years ended September 30, 2016 and 2015, with report of independent auditors; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1921. A letter from the Acting DAA for Regulatory Programs, NMFSS, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fireworks Displays at Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary [Docket No.: 161216999-7516-02] (RIN: 0648-BG50) received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1922. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Report of the Attorney General to the Congress of the United States on the Administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act for the six months ending December 31, 2016, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 621; June 8, 1938, ch. 327, Sec. 11 (as amended by Public Law 104-65, Sec. 19); (109 Stat. 704); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1923. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations and removal of temporary regulations — Guidelines for the Streamlined Process of Applying for Recognition of Section of 501(c)(3) Status [TD 9819] (RIN: 1545-BM06) received July 10, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1924. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Cumulative List of Changes in Plan Qualification Requirements for Pre-Approved Defined Contribution Plans for 2017 [Notice 2017-37] received July 10, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-

121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1925. A letter from the Branch Chief, Border Security Regulations, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Amendments: Electronic Information for Cargo Exported from the United States [CBP Dec. 17-06] received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

1926. A letter from the Acting Chief Privacy Officer, Privacy Office, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Privacy Office's Fiscal Year 2017 Semiannual Report to Congress as required by Sec. 803 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

1927. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting a Train and Equip Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Armed Services. Supplemental report on H.R. 2810. A bill to authorize appropriation for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes. Ordered to be printed. (Rept. 115-200, Pt. 2).

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2430. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs, medical devices, generic drugs, and biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 597. A bill to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 954. A bill to remove the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1306. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1404. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Tucson Unified School District and to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona (Rept. 115-205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1397. A bill to authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the transfer

of administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal land, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-206, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1541. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property related to the Fort Scott National Historic Site in Fort Scott, Kansas, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1719. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 115-208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1913. A bill to establish the Clear Creek National Recreation Area in San Benito and Fresno Counties, California, to designate the Joaquin Rocks Wilderness in such counties, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2156. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national memorial and national monument to commemorate those killed by the collapse of the Saint Francis Dam on March 12, 1928, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2868. A bill to protect National Flood Insurance Program policyholders from unreasonable premium rates and to require the Program to consider the unique characteristics of urban properties, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 431. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 23) to provide drought relief in the State of California, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-212). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1397 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 3175. A bill to establish privacy protections for customers of broadband Internet access service and other telecommunications services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MACARTHUR (for himself, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. DELANEY,

Mr. JONES, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. FASO):

H.R. 3176. A bill to prohibit the Federal Emergency Management Agency from recouping certain assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3177. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the requirement to provide nursing home care to certain veterans with service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 3178. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the delivery of home infusion therapy and dialysis and the application of the Stark rule under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:

H.R. 3179. A bill to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies, when issuing certain prudential regulations that are substantially more stringent than a corresponding international prudential standard to publish the rationale for doing so and a cost-benefit analysis of the difference, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 3180. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 3181. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to encourage Medicare beneficiaries to voluntarily adopt advance directives guiding the medical care they receive; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 3182. A bill to amend section 317A of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for screenings and referrals regarding lead poisoning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. BRAT, Mr. TAYLOR, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 3183. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13683 James Madison Highway in Palmyra, Virginia, as the "U.S. Navy Seaman Dakota

Kyle Rigsby Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. BRAT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. TAYLOR, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 3184. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 180 McCormick Road in Charlottesville, Virginia, as the "Captain Humayun Khan Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio:

H.R. 3185. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to evaluate the organizational structure of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. TSONGAS (for herself, Mr. TIP-TON, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. STEFANK):

H.R. 3186. A bill to establish an Every Kid Outdoors program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 3187. A bill to advance United States interests in the freedom of navigation by enhancing congressional oversight of freedom of navigation operations conducted by the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER:

H. Res. 432. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of any general appropriations bill until a concurrent resolution on the budget has been adopted or the appropriate budgetary suballocations are made available; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H. Res. 433. A resolution disapproving of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage Committee Inscription of Hebron as a Palestinian World Heritage Site in Danger; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. HULTGREN):

H. Res. 434. A resolution condemning violence against religious minorities in the People's Republic of China and any actions that limit the free expression and practice of faith by these minorities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. LANDEVIN):

H. Res. 435. A resolution recognizing the millions of youth in this nation benefitting from youth sports and the parents, volunteers, and local and national organizations that make youth sports in this country possible, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida):

H. Res. 436. A resolution expressing support for the designation of July 29, 2017, as

“Paralympic and Adaptive Sport Day”; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Veterans’ Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

93. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 9, urging Congress not to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or its most important provisions; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 3188. A bill for the relief of Christopher William Gard, Constance Rhoda Keely Yates, and Charles Matthew William Gard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 3189. A bill for the relief of Christopher William Gard, Constance Rhoda Keely Yates, and Charles Matthew William Gard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 3190. A bill for the relief of Christopher William Gard, Constance Rhoda Keely Yates, and Charles Matthew William Gard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3175.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 3176.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article 1, Section, Clause 18

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3177.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

The Congress shall have Power to the United States Constitution which empowers Congress “To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;”

And; Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power to the United States Constitution which empowers Congress “To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.”

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 3178.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:

H.R. 3179.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 3180.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, including those under Title 50, are carried out to support the national security interests of the United States, to enable the armed forces of the United States, and to support the President in executing the foreign policy of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides, in pertinent part, that “Congress shall have power . . . to . . . provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States”; “. . . to raise and support armies . . .”; to “make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water”; and “To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 3181.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 3182.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 3183.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 3184.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio:

H.R. 3185.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power*** To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 3186.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 3187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 3188

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4: “The Congress shall have Power To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization”

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 3189

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4: “The Congress shall have Power To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization”

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 3190

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4: “The Congress shall have Power To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization”

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 19: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 25: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 36: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 48: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 93: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 95: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 154: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 187: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 203: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 205: Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 206: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 224: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 227: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 233: Mr. GRUJALVA and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 350: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 367: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 398: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. FASO, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BRAT, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. POLIS, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 449: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 468: Mr. POLIS and Mr. BACON.

H.R. 490: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 540: Ms. LEE and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 553: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 564: Mr. JONES and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.

H.R. 619: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 664: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 721: Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 740: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 743: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 747: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. TITUS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. YODER, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 750: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 758: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 761: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 785: Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 788: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 792: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

- H.R. 795: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 806: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 807: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MENG, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 828: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 848: Mr. RATCLIFFE.
H.R. 849: Mr. KILMER, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. AMASH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 858: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 873: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 908: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 911: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 931: Mr. CORREA, Mr. KEATING, Mr. EMMER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 959: Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 982: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 986: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 997: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 1017: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 1046: Mr. BLUM.
H.R. 1054: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1057: Mr. CORREA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 1059: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 1090: Mr. ZELDIN and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1094: Mr. HIGGINS of New York and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1104: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 1122: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1130: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 1134: Mr. O'ROURKE and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1146: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 1158: Mr. DENT, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GIBBS, and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1160: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1164: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. PALMER, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 1171: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1173: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 1205: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 1223: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1231: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1239: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 1243: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 1253: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1270: Mr. COHEN and Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 1291: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1316: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 1318: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1322: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 1359: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 1399: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 1406: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 1409: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1457: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 1491: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 1519: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1537: Mr. WEBBER of Texas.
H.R. 1552: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 1553: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 1554: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1563: Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 1626: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 1639: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1645: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 1651: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1661: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ISSA, and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1676: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 1685: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 1686: Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 1698: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. HURD, and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 1699: Mr. RATCLIFFE and Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 1710: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1731: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 1739: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 1748: Mr. EVANS and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1781: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 1810: Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 1811: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1815: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 1817: Mr. GAETZ and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 1836: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1838: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 1841: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1843: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1853: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1861: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1865: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 1881: Mr. EMMER and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1911: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. FASO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 1928: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1937: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1953: Ms. MENG, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1963: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1974: Ms. NORTON and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1997: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2011: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2023: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 2040: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. BLUM.
H.R. 2069: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 2091: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2120: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2133: Mr. TROTT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. BOST.
H.R. 2142: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 2158: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2159: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2197: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2200: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 2205: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 2225: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. TITUS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 2259: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2287: Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 2299: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 2307: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 2315: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2319: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2322: Mr. HUIZENGA.
H.R. 2340: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GIANFORTE, and Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 2345: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 2417: Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SOTO, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 2422: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 2428: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2431: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 2435: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2445: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2451: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 2475: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MENG, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. POLIS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2478: Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HULTGREEN.
H.R. 2480: Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 2482: Mr. PETERS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 2486: Mr. POCAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2501: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 2505: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2519: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HECK, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 2550: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2556: Ms. TITUS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 2584: Mr. BRADY of Texas and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2622: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 2651: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2653: Mr. KEATING, Mr. CRIST, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 2663: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. CUREBELO of Florida, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 2664: Mr. MESSER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2666: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 2683: Mr. ARRINGTON.
H.R. 2687: Ms. MOORE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. HECK.
H.R. 2690: Mr. KIHUEN.
H.R. 2706: Mr. FASO.
H.R. 2723: Mrs. LOVE and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 2732: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2733: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. RUSH, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2740: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. ESPALLAT, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 2765: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 2775: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 2776: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 2777: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2796: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 2809: Mr. DUNN and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2826: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2841: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2845: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2856: Mr. BACON, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KATKO, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 2868: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2875: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2886: Mr. KHANNA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PAL-LONE, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2901: Mr. GALLEGRO and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 2902: Mr. HARPER, Ms. DELBENE, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 2911: Mr. SOTO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 2915: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 2918: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 2926: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2932: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2933: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2938: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 2939: Mr. BUCK.

H.R. 2942: Mr. KIHUEN.

H.R. 2943: Mr. EVANS and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 2957: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 2961: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2967: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 2989: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3000: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 3006: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 3032: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3036: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 3038: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 3040: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 3048: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 3079: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 3086: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 3097: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 3100: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 3101: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 3107: Mr. LONG and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 3108: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 3117: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 3163: Ms. DEGETTE and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 3164: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 3171: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.J. Res. 33: Ms. SPEIER.

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. MARINO, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.J. Res. 53: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H. Con. Res. 68: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H. Res. 15: Mr. LEVIN.

H. Res. 30: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H. Res. 41: Mr. GAETZ.

H. Res. 161: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KIND, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. RUPPERS-BERGER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 206: Mr. LEVIN.

H. Res. 220: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. COFFMAN.

H. Res. 252: Mr. ESTES of Kansas and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H. Res. 257: Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H. Res. 265: Mrs. BEATTY.

H. Res. 276: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H. Res. 279: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H. Res. 282: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H. Res. 307: Mr. GAETZ and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H. Res. 320: Mr. KNIGHT.

H. Res. 336: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H. Res. 337: Ms. FUDGE.

H. Res. 345: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. ROSEN.

H. Res. 353: Mr. BEYER.

H. Res. 359: Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H. Res. 393: Mr. WELCH.

H. Res. 400: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H. Res. 401: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. KATKO.

H. Res. 407: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.

H. Res. 423: Mr. TAKANO.

H. Res. 426: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KHANNA, and Ms. ROSEN.

H. Res. 430: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP

The provisions in H. R. 23 that warranted a referral to the Committee on Natural Resources do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Agriculture in H.R. 23 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Amendment No. 1 to be offered by Representative MAC THORNBERRY to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H. Res. 399: Mr. STIVERS.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 11, 2017

No. 116

Senate

The Senate met at 2:15 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable ROB PORTMAN, a Senator from the State of Ohio.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord God, source of righteousness and the center of our joy, forgive us when we assume we know what is right without seeking Your wisdom. Inspire our lawmakers to think Your thoughts, to listen for Your directions, and to follow Your guidance. Lord, lead them to seek what is best for our Nation and world, depending always on Your sovereignty and might. May they constantly remember that You possess all power and can accomplish the seemingly impossible if they would only believe. Continue to sustain them with Your might, showering them with Your bountiful blessings.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable ROB PORTMAN, a Senator from the State of Ohio, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PORTMAN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the Nye nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David C. Nye, of Idaho, to be United States District Judge for the District of Idaho.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am going to speak for about 5 minutes. Before I begin, I will reference an item that I ask unanimous consent be printed in the RECORD following my speech.

I rise to share real stories of real hardships from hard-working families in my home State of Iowa. Seven years ago, Americans were promised that the Affordable Care Act would make health insurance cheaper and healthcare more accessible. Well, I will not pretend to break any news here. The facts speak for themselves: ObamaCare is not liv-

ing up to its promises. When passing the law, the other side made promises they knew could not be kept.

The irony is, the so-called Affordable Care Act is anything but affordable. I have heard from many Iowans who tell me, in no uncertain terms, that they cannot afford to buy health insurance because ObamaCare is unaffordable. In fact, 72,000 Iowans can't even get help from the exchange because there isn't an insurance company to service them.

One Iowan wrote to me:

I am forced to pay \$230 a month for a healthcare plan that covers nothing until I reach \$11,000 in deductible. So on top of paying 100 percent of my medical bills anyway, now I also have to pay for insurance I can't use.

How did we get to this point?

Seven years ago, I spoke right here on the Senate floor and predicted what would happen to the cost of insurance if ObamaCare passed. So let's go back to that period of time when I spoke in October of 2009. This is my own quote from that speech:

And while some of the supporters of these partisan bills may not want to tell their constituents, we all know that as national spending on health care insurance increases, American families will bear the burden in the form of higher premiums. So let me be very clear, as a result of the current pending health care proposals, most Americans will pay higher premiums for health insurance.

That is the end of my quote from a speech in the Senate in October of 2009.

Now, I don't have a magic crystal ball, but it was easy to read the writing on the wall. I knew that layers of new taxes and burdensome new mandates in ObamaCare would lead us to where we find ourselves today: a broken healthcare system that is not better off than it was 7 years ago, and for millions of Americans—including those 72,000 Iowans—it is much worse.

So where do we go from here? After 7 years of rising premiums, soaring deductibles, and climbing copays, Republicans are committed to fixing the damage caused by the Affordable Care

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S3889

Act. Not only is it unaffordable for too many people, it is unsustainable. ObamaCare is unable to fulfill its promises to the American people.

Here is what every lawmaker in Congress ought to agree on: Insurance isn't worth having if patients can't afford to use that insurance. The facts are clear. A one-size-fits-all, government-run plan from Washington, DC, is driving insurers out of the exchanges, driving up premiums, driving away customers, and driving up the tab to the tax-paying public.

ObamaCare has overregulated, overtaxed, and oversold its promises to the American people. ObamaCare has not healed what ails the U.S. healthcare system. It is time to move forward.

Mr. President, I also want to speak about Medicaid for a moment.

Medicaid, as we know it, is not sustainable. The Federal Government and States spent \$553 billion on Medicaid in 2016. That amount is very close to \$593 billion spent on the No. 1 responsibility of the Federal Government—our Nation's defense.

Every decade since Medicaid started, it has grown faster than the economy. Medicaid is now unmatched as a driver of the deficit of our country. We cannot sit by and leave this kind of debt to our children and our grandchildren.

Dollars are not the only metric by which we measure Medicaid. Medicaid is a program that should supply healthcare to diverse populations and should have quality measured, but it does not.

Medicaid dollars should be spent efficiently, but they are not. Activists in Washington, DC, are fighting to preserve the status quo and, of course, in the process, scaring the daylights out of the American people.

Yet Iowans tell me that there are waiting lists for Medicaid waivers to obtain services for children with disabilities. Others tell me that medicines that will cure diseases are rationed to be used only with those with the most advanced disease. In other words, you have to get really sick for Medicaid to cover medical expenses.

It is a fact that Medicaid is not working the way it should for everyone. The time to act to preserve and improve Medicaid as the safety net for the most vulnerable citizens is right now.

I am holding up a letter here because, under a Democratic President, proposing to do what we are doing, 46 Democrat Senators wrote to President Clinton and expressed their "strong support" for Medicaid per capita caps. The letter went on to say that it would give States the flexibility to achieve savings without cuts to essential services. That is what the current proposal aims to do as well.

We are proposing per capita caps as a way to make sure tax dollars are spent wisely on the most vulnerable people in our Nation. Medicaid dollars should be spent on a child with cystic fibrosis who needs a blockbuster drug. A person with severe mental illness should be able to rely on Medicaid for care.

Medicaid cannot continue to be a limitless credit card for the States to spend money without any accountability to the people who need it. I urge my colleagues to put aside partisan dogma and work to solve this problem for the American people.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 13, 1995.

President WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to express our strong support for the Medicaid per-capita cap structure in your seven-year budget. We have fought against Medicaid block grants and cuts in the Senate, and we are glad you acknowledge the importance of our position.

We support a balanced budget. We are glad you agree with us that we can balance the budget without undermining the health of children, pregnant women, the disabled, and the elderly.

The savings level of \$54 billion over seven years included in your budget will require rigorous efficiencies and economies in the program. However, after consulting with many Medicaid Directors and service providers across the country, we believe a reduction of this level is possible to achieve without dramatic limits on eligibility or cuts to essential services. States will need flexibility to achieve these savings, and you have taken steps toward granting it in your bill.

We were encouraged that your Medicaid proposal does not pit Medicaid populations against one another in a fight over a limited pot of federal resources.

We were further encouraged to hear Chief of Staff Panetta relay your commitment to veto any budget not containing a fundamental guarantee to Medicaid for eligible Americans.

We commend you on the courage you have exercised in making these commitments to Americans eligible for Medicaid. There is a bottom line when it comes to people's health; do not allow the current Congressional leadership to further reduce our commitment to Medicaid beneficiaries.

Your current proposal is fair and reasonable, and is consistent with what we have advocated on the Senate floor. We urge you in the strongest possible terms to hold fast to these commitments in further negotiations. We are prepared to offer any assistance you may need in this regard.

Sincerely,

Bob Graham; John Breaux; Jay Rockefeller; Herb Kohl; Patrick Leahy; Frank R. Lautenberg; Ted Kennedy; Tom Daschle; Patty Murray; Barbara Boxer; David Pryor; Barbara A. Mikulski; Max Baucus; Paul Simon; Kent Conrad; Wendell Ford; Harry Reid; Paul Wellstone; Richard H. Bryan; Ernest Hollings; Dianne Feinstein; Tom Harkin; Byron L. Dorgan; Chris Dodd; J. Bennett Johnston; Joe Lieberman; Paul Sarbanes; Carol Mosely-Braun; John Glenn; Jeff Bingaman; Carl Levin; Bill Bradley; John F. Kerry; Bob Kerrey; Joe Biden; Daniel K. Akaka; Dale Bumpers; Daniel Inouye; Chuck Robb; J. James Exon; Howell Heflin; Claiborne Pell; Russ Feingold; Daniel P. Moynihan; Sam Nunn; Robert C. Byrd.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MISSISSIPPI PLANE CRASH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I want to start this afternoon by offering deepest condolences to the Marine Corps and to all those who lost loved ones in the tragic plane crash yesterday in Mississippi. We are still learning details about the incident, but we know that at least 16 on board the plane perished as a result of the crash. Our hearts break for all those impacted and the many lives cut short in this tragedy. We are reminded of the bravery that our voluntary servicemembers exhibit, putting their lives on the line, both at home and abroad, in order to defend our communities and our freedom. We are indebted to them for their courageous, courageous sacrifice.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, on a totally different matter, ObamaCare is a direct attack on the middle class. Seven years ago, Democrats imposed it on our country. In the years since, Americans have found themselves at the mercy of its failures repeatedly. Choice was supposed to go up, but it plummeted. Costs were supposed to go down, but they skyrocketed.

ObamaCare's defenders spent years trying to deny these clear realities. When the weight of the evidence became too clear to ignore, some appeared to bemoan ObamaCare's harmful impact on our country.

The Democratic Governor of Minnesota declared that it was "no longer affordable." President Clinton branded it "the craziest thing in the world." Other Democrats said similar things.

Such acknowledgements of the obvious seemed to many of us like progress, but they turned out to be just rhetoric. In the last election, voters delivered Congress the opportunity to finally address the ObamaCare status quo. Yet Democrats made clear early on that they did not want to work with us in a serious, bipartisan way to actually do so.

I wish they had made a different choice. I wish their sudden calls for bipartisanship now were even somewhat serious, but this is the reality before us. We must accept it because that is where we are.

As my Republican colleagues know, this is the charge we must accept as well. The American people are looking to us for a better way. That is why, despite the headwinds, I chose to keep working toward a better solution than ObamaCare. I have seen the pain in the eyes of too many of my constituents because of this law. I think they deserve better than what ObamaCare has given them. I hope, in the end, that a majority of the Senate will agree.

We have been continuing with ongoing conversations across the conference about how to get there. Members shared significant input over the State work period. We are going to keep working very hard on this. We will continue to focus on the fundamentals that have guided the process from the start, like improving the affordability

of health insurance and stabilizing collapsing insurance markets before they leave even more Americans without any options at all.

We also want to strengthen Medicaid for those who need it most by giving States more flexibility while ensuring that those who rely on the program don't have the rug pulled out from under them.

Many States want the ability to reform their Medicaid programs so they can actually deliver better care at a lower cost. Under current law, States have some ability to do so. Indiana, for example, has launched a particularly notable effort, thanks to the leadership of now-CMS Director Seema Verma.

Ms. Verma has also helped States like Kentucky develop their own plans, but the process is still too restrictive. It hinders broader innovation, and it is very slow. Kentucky's plan, for instance, still has not been approved by the Federal Government.

The Senate's healthcare legislation contains a provision to dramatically expand the State's authority to improve its Medicaid system. It is an idea that could significantly improve healthcare in States across the country. The Wall Street Journal wrote in a recent editorial:

This booster shot of federalism could become the greatest devolution of federal power to the states in the modern era. [It could] launch a burst of state innovation.

The Journal went on further:

Introducing many competing health-care models across the country would be healthy. California and South Carolina don't—and shouldn't—have to follow one uniform prototype designed in Washington, and even a state as large as California doesn't have the same needs from region to region [within the State]. If nothing else the repeal and replace debate has shown that liberals, conservatives and centrists have different health-care priorities, and allowing different approaches and experimentation would be politically therapeutic. The more innovative can become examples to those that stay heavily regulated.

It is clear that we have an important opportunity to achieve positive things for our country. It is also clear that, if we let this opportunity pass by, the options left are not good ones.

The Senate Democratic leader acknowledges that ObamaCare isn't working the way they promised, but his solution, as he noted in a statement last week, is simply more money for insurance companies. The solution would be an insurance company bailout—no reforms, no changes, just more money to paper over the problems under the current law. It is a multibillion-dollar bandaid, not a real solution.

Senator SANDERS acknowledges that ObamaCare isn't working, too, but his solution, as he stated in my State over the weekend, is to move to the kind of fully government-run single-payer system that was already abandoned in his home State of Vermont, that 80 percent of the voters recently rejected in Colorado, and that even the California State Legislature and its huge Demo-

cratic majority is finding rather hard to swallow.

Is it any wonder? The so-called single-payer plan Senator SANDERS proposed in his Presidential campaign would strip Americans of so many facets of decisionmaking over their own healthcare and literally hand it over to the government. It would require almost unimaginably high tax increases—unimaginably high.

The cost, according to a recent analysis by the Urban Institute, stands at an astonishing—listen to this—\$32 trillion. That is trillion with a “t.” That represents a greater sum than the entire economy of the most populous nation on Earth—China. It is more than Japan's economy, too—and Germany's, Britain's, and France's. It is the same with Italy's, Brazil's, India's, and Canada's.

In fact, the cost of Senator SANDERS' healthcare plan is projected to be roughly equal to the size of all nine of those countries' economies combined. It would total more than the entire economy of the European Union twice over. If you laid out 32 trillion one-dollar bills end to end, they would stretch from the Earth to Neptune. It took the Voyager 2 spacecraft 12 years to reach Neptune.

That is the government-run single-payer plan put forward by the most famous proponent of the idea. Many in the Senate Democratic leadership now support single-payer, too, and these days, increasing numbers on the left seem to openly comment on the failures of ObamaCare, as if they see an opportunity to finally realize their leftwing dream of total government dominance of the healthcare system.

That is the dream of many on the other side in this body. That will not happen if we succeed in our charge today. Americans deserve better than what we are getting under ObamaCare. They deserve better than what they get under an even more government-heavy system than we have now. They also deserve better than a bandaid solution.

The people we represent deserve more affordable health insurance. They deserve improved healthcare choice. They deserve a more flexible Medicaid system that can help improve outcomes for those truly in need. They deserve a more responsive healthcare market that trusts the American people to make more of their own choices, not the government.

That is what we have been fighting for throughout this debate. That is what we are going to keep fighting for today.

Mr. President, on one final matter, believe it or not, the current business before the Senate is the consideration of a noncontroversial nominee to be a U.S. district judge in Idaho—Idaho.

How do we know he is noncontroversial? Well, the Judiciary Committee reported out his nomination on a voice vote, and, then, every single Senate Democrat voted yesterday for cloture on his nomination, thereby agreeing

that there is no need to continue debate on this noncontroversial nomination—a noncontroversial district court judge.

Why are we still having a debate on a noncontroversial district court judge? If they agree that the Senate should bring the debate on the nomination to a close, then, why did they insist on dragging out the 30 hours of postcloture debate time in order to debate a nomination that not a single Democrat said needed to have more debate?

We all know the answer. It is that the unnecessary procedural vote yesterday served our colleagues' apparent purpose of wasting—literally wasting—more of the Senate's time. Unfortunately, this has become a common practice for our friends across the aisle.

At this point in President Obama's Presidency, we allowed more than 90 percent of his nominees to clear by simple voice vote. Let me say that again. At this point in President Obama's Presidency, we allowed more than 90 percent of his nominees to clear by a simple voice vote, and we only asked for those procedural votes known as cloture votes eight times. At the same point under this current President, President Trump, Democrats have allowed voice votes 10 percent of the time. While 90 percent of Obama's nominees got a voice vote, 10 percent of Trump's got a voice vote, and they forced procedural hurdles 30 times.

These delays have nothing to do with the credentials or whether Democrats support the nominee. In many cases, in fact, they do support the nominee, like the nominee before us.

As the Wall Street Journal observed yesterday:

Democratic obstruction against nominees is nearly total, most notably including a demand for cloture filings for every nominee—no matter how minor the position.

What does this mean? It means a 2-day waiting period and then another 30 hours beyond that. It is not about changing the outcome; it is about wasting time to make it more difficult for the President to make appointments.

According to the nonpartisan Partnership for Public Service, at this point in President Obama's administration, he had 183 of his nominees confirmed. While the current President has made 178 nominations—almost as many—the Senate has confirmed only 46 of them.

The Wall Street Journal editorial I mentioned goes on to note that the extent of this Democratic obstruction extends far beyond the cloture vote issue. I have discussed this issue before, and I urge the Democratic minority to think critically about the consequences for the Senate and our country if they allow this near-total obstruction to continue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal editorial I just mentioned be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 10, 2017]

RUNNING THE SCHUMER BLOCKADE: THE GOP SENATE NEEDS TO STOP DEMOCRATIC ABUSE OF THE RULES

(By the Editorial Board)

The Trump Presidency is well into its seventh month but the Trump Administration still barely exists. Senate Democrats are abusing Senate rules to undermine the executive branch, and Republicans need to restore normal order.

President Trump got an inexcusably slow start making nominations, but in the past few weeks he's been catching up to his predecessors. According to the Partnership for Public Service, as of June 28 Mr. Trump had nominated 178 appointees but the Senate had confirmed only 46. Barack Obama had 183 nominees confirmed by that date in his first term, and George W. Bush 130.

The White House has understandably begun to make a public issue of the delays, and Minority Leader Chuck Schumer says it "has only itself to blame." But a press release Mr. Schumer sent out Monday made the White House case, showing that the Senate has received 242 nominations but confirmed only 50 through June 30. Democrats are now the problem.

Among the non-controversial nominees awaiting confirmation: Kevin Hassell to lead the White House Council of Economic Advisers; David Malpass, under secretary at Treasury for international affairs; two nominees needed to review pipelines and other projects at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and Noel Francisco for Solicitor General. Mr. Malpass was nominated in March and voted out of committee in mid-June. Mr. Trump's State Department is barely functioning with only eight confirmed appointees.

Democratic obstruction against nominees is nearly total, most notably including a demand for cloture filings for every nominee—no matter how minor the position. This means a two-day waiting period and then another 30 hours of debate. The 30-hour rule means Mr. Trump might not be able to fill all of those 400 positions in four years. The cloture rule also allows the minority to halt other business during the 30-hour debate period, which helps slow the GOP policy and oversight agenda.

Democrats have also refused to return a single "blue slip" to the Judiciary Committee, which has the effect of blocking consideration of judicial nominees from their home states. Senators like Minnesota's Al Franken and Amy Klobuchar are holding hostage the eminently qualified Minnesota Supreme Court Justice David Stras for the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals for no reason other than politics.

Minority Leader Chuck Schumer's troops are even invoking an obscure rule that prohibits committees from doing business more than two hours after the Senate opens for the day. Republicans have had to cancel briefings on national security and Russia electoral interference, as well as scrap a markup of two human-trafficking bills.

Democrat Harry Reid didn't have the cloture headache when he was Majority Leader because in 2013 he cut a deal with Republicans. The GOP traded the ability to offer more amendments to legislation in return for letting Mr. Reid limit post-cloture debate for most nominations to eight hours. This

rule let Mr. Reid confirm dozens of judicial and lower-cabinet nominations every week. But the deal expired in early 2015, and good luck getting Mr. Schumer to grant the GOP the same terms.

Frustrated Republicans may soon begin listening to Oklahoma Senator Jim Lankford, who wants the majority to impose the eight-hour rule unilaterally. Most debate about nominees occurs during vetting and in committees. Eight hours on the floor is enough for all but the most controversial nominees, and the Senate could then get back to other business.

As for the blue-slip tradition, it was designed to facilitate advice and consent by allowing Senators to use their home-state knowledge about local judges to better inform the White House. But it is a courtesy, not a rule, and Judiciary Chairman Chuck Grassley can ignore Senators who are using their blue slips as ideological vetoes of qualified candidates.

Mr. Trump has nominated first-rate judges, and Mr. Grassley is justified in suspending blue-slip privileges on a case-by-case basis. Majority Leader Mitch McConnell has also been starting the Senate at different times of the day to get around the Democratic sabotage of committee work. But note Mr. Schumer's childishness in forcing a game of Senate hide-and-seek.

Mr. McConnell will be wary of Mr. Lankford's advice to change a Senate rule in the middle of the term, but the Majority Leader rightly did so when Democrats staged a historic filibuster of Supreme Court Justice Neil Gorsuch. Democrats aren't using cloture to raise the level of debate or highlight unqualified nominees. They are using it—and have said as much—to sabotage a Presidency. That isn't what the Founders intended, and Republicans have every right to stop this abuse of process to let the President form a government.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, as the leader has very ably pointed out, the Democratic obstruction when it comes to President Trump's nominees is reaching an unprecedented level if you compare it to any past administration. He pointed out the number of nominees President Obama was able to get in and the way in which Republicans here in the Senate cooperated with him on his nominees. This state of affairs here in the Senate really is taking the obstructionism when it comes to trying to block even getting people into the administration, into their positions, to an entirely new level.

Frankly, about the only thing that probably exceeds the pileup of President Trump's nominees who are not getting into his administration is the pileup of bad ObamaCare news stories. Just take a look at a few of the recent headlines.

From the Cincinnati Enquirer: "Another insurer leaves Ohio health care exchange."

From Bloomberg: "Anthem's Exit Creates Obamacare 'Crisis' for Rural Nevadans."

From the Washington Free Beacon: "Recent Obamacare Insurer Exits Lead to 2 More Counties With No Choices."

This is another headline from the Washington Free Beacon: "19th Obamacare Co-Op Folds, Leaving Only 4 Operating in 2018."

Across the United States, the story is the same—huge premium increases, fewer choices, and a system that is well on its way to complete collapse.

In late May, the Department of Health and Human Services released a report comparing the average individual market insurance premium in 2013, which was the year most of ObamaCare's regulations and mandates were implemented, with the average individual market exchange premium in 2017 in the 39 States that use healthcare.gov. This is what they found:

Between 2013 and 2017, the average individual market monthly premium in the healthcare.gov States increased by 105 percent. That is in the 4-year timeframe since ObamaCare was implemented. On average, individual market premiums more than doubled in just those few years.

In my home State of South Dakota, premiums increased by 124 percent, or \$3,588. That is money South Dakota families had to take from other priorities, such as saving for retirement or investing in their children's education. Over the past 5 years, the average individual market yearly premium has increased by \$4,800 in Arizona; \$8,364 in Alaska; \$3,648 in Louisiana; \$5,064 in North Carolina; \$4,488 in Tennessee; and \$5,292 in West Virginia.

Premium hikes aren't over. In fact, in many cases, they are getting worse. Here are some of the premium hikes insurers are proposing for 2018. In Maryland, one insurer has proposed an average premium increase of 52 percent. An Iowa insurer is seeking an average 43.5 percent premium increase. In North Carolina, an insurer is pursuing an average 22.9 percent hike. A Virginia insurer is looking for an average rate increase of 38 percent. A Delaware insurer is looking for an average rate hike of 33.6 percent. A Maine insurer is seeking an average rate hike of 40 percent. I could go on. Remember, these are rate hikes for just 1 year. The double-digit rate hikes for next year are in addition to years upon years of dramatic Obama premium increases, as I already pointed out.

The ObamaCare status quo is not sustainable. This law was fatally flawed from the beginning, and it is rapidly imploding. The American people need relief. Inaction is not an option.

My colleagues across the aisle seem to want to do one of two things. They either want to do nothing, which would leave Americans even worse off than they are now, or they want to double down on ObamaCare's failures by giving the government even more control over Americans' healthcare and then raising Americans' taxes to pay for it. Neither one of those so-called solutions will provide relief to the American people.

Republicans are committed to providing real help to the millions of Americans who have been hurt by ObamaCare, and we are working on legislation to do just that. My colleagues

in the House made a good start, and we are working to build on their bill here in the Senate.

We are committed to helping to stabilize the collapsing insurance markets that left millions of Americans with no options. We are committed to freeing the American people from the onerous ObamaCare individual mandate, which requires Americans to purchase insurance that they may not want or can't afford. We are committed to improving the affordability of health insurance, which keeps getting more expensive under ObamaCare. We are committed to preserving access to care for Americans with preexisting conditions. We are committed to strengthening Medicaid for those who need it most by giving States more flexibility while ensuring that those who rely on this program don't have the rug pulled out from under them.

The American people have suffered under ObamaCare for long enough. It is time to give them some relief, and that is what we intend to do.

NORTH KOREA

Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes today to discuss the serious threat posed by a nuclear-capable North Korea.

Last week, on the Fourth of July, North Korea leader Kim Jong Un took the latest and possibly most alarming step in his unwavering quest for a nuclear weapon by successfully testing an intercontinental ballistic missile. Estimates suggest that the missile tested had a range of more than 4,000 miles, which means it could reach Alaska. North Korea has not yet demonstrated the ability to arm these missiles with nuclear warheads, but that day may not be far off.

North Korea's nuclear program has achieved a disturbing number of milestones in this year alone. The United States must do everything we can to prevent a nuclear-capable North Korea, but we must also be prepared should Kim Jong Un put the final pieces together, and that starts with maintaining a credible military deterrence.

This weekend's B-1 bomber flights were but a sliver of the response the United States could bring to bear in direct military engagement.

Gen. Terrence O'Shaughnessy, commander of the Pacific Air Forces, said of the exercises:

Let me be clear, if called upon, we are trained, equipped, and ready to unleash the full, lethal capability of our allied air forces.

We need to make sure we maintain that lethal capability. Congress has a key role to play here by making sure we adequately fund our military and pass defense appropriations in a timely manner.

While Kim Jong Un has not shown much of an inclination toward rationality, we need to keep emphatically reminding him that his regime would not survive a war on the Korean Peninsula.

A robust and redundant defense is also an important component of the U.S. and allied response to North

Korea. A key part of building our defenses should be a rigorous test schedule to inform research and development of anti-ballistic missile technology.

It is true that some U.S. missile intercept tests have failed, but those setbacks have led to improvements. Some of our best men and women are working to keep us ahead of threats. We must repeatedly and aggressively test intercept systems to ensure that they are effective.

Gen. John Hyten, the head of U.S. Strategic Command, has pointed out that our testing schedule for intercept systems lags behind the pace of North Korea's aggressive missile testing.

Tuesday's successful THAAD missile defense system test against a simulated intermediate-range ballistic missile attack was a timely demonstration of this critical defense capability, and I hope we see further deployment of this promising system. Placing THAAD or the Aegis Shore missile defense system in Japan would bolster frontline defenses against future North Korean missile launches.

We should also increase information sharing and military cooperation in the area around the Korean Peninsula to ensure that sanctions are enforced. The joint maritime operations conducted by the U.S. Navy and Coast Guard and the Japanese Maritime Self-Defense Force are good examples of this cooperation.

We must also examine how we have gotten to this state. For a so-called hermit kingdom, North Korea has made significant advancements, while evading international sanctions. Those advancements, which build off a legacy of Soviet support, have been facilitated by North Korea's ties with Iran and a passive China providing North Korea with an economic lifeline. Not all the blame rests with China, but we know President Xi has proved largely unwilling to curtail North Korea's agenda.

Late last month, Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin announced sanctions on Chinese entities with financial ties to North Korea. This is a positive first step, but more can be done to target banking and front companies that serve as financial conduits for North Korea. Increased transparency in Chinese customs and export reporting, for example, would restrict oil and steel exports to North Korea and ensure that China is adhering to its ban on coal imports from North Korea.

The United States should also weigh whether new sanctions, both punitive and preventive, could exert additional pressure on China to rein in North Korea. I hope the administration will seriously consider such sanctions alongside measures to address other problematic Chinese actions, such as its continued military buildup on disputed reefs in the South China Sea.

Kim Jong Un is clearly ready and willing to threaten the United States and its allies, and we should have no illusions that he is planning to reverse

course. We need to make sure that we are prepared for any threat he or his regime poses.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to speak on behalf of a group of Floridians I have met with who would be tremendously hard-hit by the healthcare bill, whether it be the one that has already been published by the majority leader or some of the iterations that are being discussed.

I want to talk on behalf of and be the spokesperson for these people who have cried out to me. I want to say that people are crying out. It is not just the group of four families I assembled in my Tampa office last week, but it also includes walking down the street, being in an airport, or going into a public building. Constantly, folks are walking up to me and saying: Please, don't let them take away my healthcare.

Just this past week, I was in—it shall remain nameless—a Republican Senator's State. It happened in the airport there as my colleague, the Republican Senator in that State other than mine—the travelers, the constituents of that Senator in the airport as we were waiting for the airplane walked up to that Republican Senator and begged: Please don't take away my healthcare.

What we have seen in this Republican bill is that it takes health insurance away from millions of Americans. That is not my conclusion; that is the conclusion of the Congressional Budget Office. According to CBO, it also cuts back some \$800 billion out of Medicaid over a decade, and it allows insurance companies to hike rates for older Americans.

Under the bill, 22 million people would lose their insurance by 2026. Over 2 million of these folks are in Florida. In fact, the bill would increase the uninsured rate in Florida by 62 percent. That is not what I want inflicted on the folks in Florida.

This bill lets insurance companies go back to the days when they had annual and lifetime limits on coverage and refused to cover basic health benefits, such as prescription drugs, mental health services, and even maternity care. This Republican healthcare bill, which has been so much the subject in the news and the center of the debate here for the past innumerable weeks, really does cut Medicaid. According to CBO—again, not my words; CBO's words—funding will be 26 percent lower in Medicaid by the year 2026 than under the existing law.

My home State of Florida is projected to lose \$5.7 billion in Federal Medicaid funding from 2020 to 2026 under the bill that is proposed by the majority leader. If that is not enough, the Senate bill would dramatically increase healthcare costs for Americans between the ages of 50 to 64 before they turn that magic age of 65 when they are eligible for Medicare. It dramatically increases those costs. That dramatic rise in cost is due in large part to a provision that would allow insurance companies to charge older Americans up to five times what younger people are charged. The current law, the Affordable Care Act, has a differential of 3 to 1. This bill as proposed has a differential of 5 to 1. So if you are not on Medicare because you haven't turned 65 and you are an older American in those ages—which increasingly seem very young to me—up to age 64 when the differential from what the insurance company charges the young person is five times, not three times, as is the current law, this would especially be felt among those older individuals making between \$42,000 and \$48,000 a year who, after that point, no longer qualify for the tax credits under the Republican bill to make coverage more affordable.

Remember, in the current law, up to 400 percent of poverty level, you are entitled to get tax credits according to what your income is to help you buy private health insurance from insurance companies on the marketplaces in each State. Even that is going to be reduced.

This bill also includes a backdoor provision that undermines the protections that currently exist for people with preexisting conditions. In defending the bill, people will argue that it doesn't do that, but look what the bill says. It says that it can be left up to the States to determine that. What is a way that the State can lessen the cost of insurance premiums? Take away the guarantee that someone can get insurance if they have a preexisting condition.

I have given a number of speeches. I have had some experience in this as the former elected insurance commissioner of Florida, when it was an elected position. It was also a constitutional position of the State treasury. I held that position for 6 years, and I have dealt with insurance companies. I have seen some insurance companies say: You have a preexisting condition. We are not going to insure you because you have asthma. I have even seen an insurance company cite: We are not going to insure you because you have a preexisting condition; you had a rash.

Under the current law, an insurance company cannot deny you insurance because of whatever your preexisting condition is. Your preexisting condition may be that you have a weak heart, and you, of all people, would want health insurance. Before, you couldn't get it. Now, under the current law, you can.

I don't want you to hear this plea over and over again from me. I want the pleas from several Floridians to reach out across the State lines and get to the Senators who are going to be voting on this. I want them to hear from some of my constituents. When I met with them last week in Tampa, I had many who said that they would be devastated if Medicaid were cut.

I want to share with you how this has personally affected them and how apprehensive and plain scared they are right now that the healthcare they are getting will cease if this bill proposed by the majority leader is to become law.

Take, for example, Michael Phillips. He is 36 years old, and he has spinal muscular atrophy. It is a genetic disorder that affects control of his muscle movement. He relies on a tracheotomy, a breathing tube, and uses assistive computer technology to be able to talk. The computer talks for him.

Michael was supposed to join us on that day, but he wasn't feeling well, and, of course, there is always the added exposure to germs in his weakened immune condition. Instead came his two caregivers, his single mother Karen and his brother Brian. Michael relies on Medicaid, which allows him to live at home with his mom and have a personal care assistant. He benefits from the Medicaid home and community-based waivers. If the waivers are eliminated because of the whacking of billions and billions of dollars from Medicaid, he would ultimately end up in a nursing home, away from his mother and his family, being forced to compromise his level of care and quality of life.

You may have seen this fellow and his mom interviewed by the national news networks. He is one and the same, Michael Phillips.

The Senate healthcare bill ends Medicaid as we know it. Whether it is a cap on the amount of money going to the State or it is called a block grant, the effect is the same. It will put people like Michael at risk of losing critical services, and it will certainly take away his independence and his quality of life.

I have already said that the bill certainly takes away the guarantee of coverage with a preexisting condition. Let me tell you about another Floridian who was in that meeting. Elizabeth Isom is from St. Petersburg, and she told me that the Affordable Care Act saved her life and allowed her to purchase insurance for the very first time. If it is taken away, she doesn't know how she is going to be able to afford coverage because of lifetime caps. An insurance company cannot put those lifetime caps on what they pay out. For example, in the old days, before the existing law, an insurance company would say: I'll pay you as long as it doesn't exceed, say, \$25,000 or \$50,000. That was all figured into their insurance payment and their premiums. In the current law there are es-

sential health benefits. There are about a dozen of them.

Elizabeth was a social worker before she developed a sinus tumor. She went without insurance for 3 years, during which time her health was deteriorating. Because she did not have health insurance, she could not afford to have that tumor operated on. What I do not know is if she knew this at the time—because she hadn't had the operation—or if she thought it was cancerous. As it turned out, later, when she was able under the Affordable Care Act to get health insurance and to have the operation, thank the good Lord it was benign. But her health had deteriorated to the point that as this thing started to grow into her sinus passages and into her brain cavity, she actually thought she was approaching death. She ended up having vital organ damage and reached the point of complete disability. The mass in her sinus had extended into her skull.

After the ACA became the law of the land, she purchased insurance through healthcare.gov. She says that it is the best insurance she has ever had because it covered essential health benefits like preventive services. It certainly provided for her to go on and get the operation, and it saved her life.

If this Senate bill passes, services that Elizabeth relies on may no longer be covered, and she likely will never be able to afford a decent health insurance package again. She obviously has a preexisting condition. She would be one of the 22 million people whom the Congressional Budget Office estimates would lose their health insurance if the bill proposed by the majority leader, Senator McCONNELL, were to become law.

Let me tell you about another Floridian. Regina Hebert is from Tampa. She is a small business owner. She was diagnosed with stage IIB breast cancer at the age of 57. She, too, told me that the ACA saved her life. Without the ACA, she would not have received health insurance because her cancer is considered a preexisting condition—57 years old, preexisting condition, stage II breast cancer. She obtained health insurance through the ACA. She had two surgeons, months of chemo and radiation, and she told me that if her cancer comes back and she doesn't have insurance, then she is going to have to choose between going bankrupt—not through what she is doing now with her small business. She is paying taxes. She is contributing to society.

What is her other choice? Her other choice is to give up. Take away her insurance and those are her choices: bankruptcy or giving up. I don't think we want to put Americans in that position. The Senate healthcare bill allows States to waive the essential health benefits—the dozen I talked about that are listed, like those needed if they have a preexisting condition.

There was another lady I met named Olivia Babis. She is from outside of

Tampa, a place called Lutz. She also has a preexisting condition. She told me that she uses the essential health benefits guaranteed by the existing law. She is scared that insurance companies would take away the coverage of treatments for her disability and also reinstate annual and lifetime limits on coverage.

Let me tell you about this young lady. She is just amazing. She was born without arms. She uses her feet and her toes to be able to function in the place of hands and fingers. She had to have a total knee replacement in one leg by the time she turned 30. She works as a community organizer. She doesn't qualify for Medicaid in Florida because her income is considered too high. She actually has an income. Olivia purchased health insurance through healthcare.gov with the help of tax credits to help her afford health insurance.

This young lady, now in her mid-thirties, is just amazing. With no arms, she uses her feet and her toes, and she is capable of getting around in her wheelchair. She is capable of driving a car. She has a business. She has an income, and she is paying taxes. She is able to function because she has health insurance.

Now, thanks to the ACA, people like Olivia benefit because there are bans on lifetime limits in insurance policies, and, thanks to the ACA, she lives an active life. She goes snorkeling, hiking, and even skydiving. Her legs are good, except for the knee replacement that she had so that she can walk. Then, when she has to do the normal functions with hands and arms, she sits down, and she uses her legs, her feet, and her toes. She told me that, without the ACA, she is trapped.

I told you about this unnamed Republican Senator who was in an airport in another State—that of the Republican Senator's. What happened to that Republican Senator happens to me back in Florida with people coming up and begging me: Please do not take away my healthcare.

We should not continue to waste our time with this healthcare bill that only takes away healthcare and charges more for less coverage. We have said—so many of us out here on this floor—that we should be looking for ways to improve the existing law, the Affordable Care Act, not to undo all of the good that it has done. We have Floridians and folks across the country who are grateful for it. They want us to fix it, not repeal it, and they say that over and over: Why can't you guys get together in a bipartisan way and fix it?

These are the personal stories of Olivia, Michael, Regina, and Elizabeth, along with the hundreds of people who have come up to me in the street or in the airport and have begged me: Do not take it away. They do not want us to get rid of this. As you have heard, several of them claim that they would not be alive today without the ACA. Alternatively, they would be bankrupt if it were not for Medicaid in the ACA.

In order to truly improve our healthcare system, why don't we work together to make it better? We need to look at real solutions. I am happy to say that this Senator has been talking to Republican Senators, and we have talked about specific things. I told some of these Senators about my experiences as the formerly elected insurance commissioner of Florida.

When I had a problem after the monster Hurricane Andrew in the early 1990s and we had a paralyzed marketplace in which you could not get homeowner's insurance in Florida from insurance companies because they were scared to death that the next big one was coming and that the losses were going to be so great that they would have to price the premiums so high, what did we do? We created a reinsurance fund called the Florida Hurricane Catastrophe Fund, which builds up the reserves that would reinsure the companies if they were to have a catastrophic loss.

The same principle with hurricanes can apply to health insurance, which is that of creating a reinsurance fund that will insure the health insurance companies against catastrophic loss, which, occasionally, they will have. Do you know something? I costed that out in Florida, and it would reduce the premiums from the marketplace in Florida by 13 percent. Now, that is a real savings, and that is just one solution for a fix. We ought to be looking at approaches like this.

I welcome all of our colleagues on this side and on that side—and I have been talking to some on that side—to join together and do something productive, like getting behind ideas just like the one that I suggested.

I heard our colleague this morning. One of our favorite colleagues out here is JOE MANCHIN from West Virginia, and I heard him being interviewed on one of the morning shows. He was terrific. He said: We need to be working together. We should not be divided by party over this, and we should not be divided ideologically on this. We ought to be openly trying to work together to figure out how to drive down healthcare costs and increase coverage for more Americans.

That is what those folks in Tampa, FL, told me last week with whom I met. That is what those hundreds of folks are telling me who come up to me in the airport, on the airplane, on the street corner, in the public buildings, in the hospitals—wherever I am: Please, get together, and work it out. They are asking us to fix what needs fixing. That is what the American people are asking us today, and that is what I beg of the Senate.

As the good Lord says: Come. Let us reason together. Let us use some of our common sense.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

THANKING THE SENATOR FROM FLORIDA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, I thank my good friend from Florida for his inspiring words. He is always trying to work together on bipartisan solutions. He represents one of the largest and most diverse States in the country—a State that very much depends on having good healthcare. I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will heed his words.

MISSISSIPPI PLANE CRASH

Mr. President, first, I send my sincere condolences to the Marine Corps, which lost 15 of its finest today, as well as 1 Navy corpsman, in a plane crash in Mississippi. It was the deadliest crash in the Marine Corps family since 2005. According to reports, the aircraft that crashed this morning was based at Stewart Air National Guard Base in my home State of New York.

Our hearts break for the families of these sailors and marines. We mourn their loss and wish comfort to their families and their loved ones in this time of tragedy.

May they rest in peace.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, on an entirely different matter, the majority leader said today that we are going to stay in an extra 2 weeks during the August break. We Democrats are willing to stay 2 weeks, 2 months, 2 years to get a good healthcare bill, but in all due respect to my good friend, the majority leader from Kentucky, it is not time that is the problem here. Our Republican colleagues for 7 years said: Repeal ObamaCare. But they had nothing to put in its place. Then President Trump was elected with a Republican majority in the House and the Senate. Since January 4, when they deliberately excluded us from all discussions by enacting a reconciliation bill, they have been trying to put together a healthcare bill. They cannot. It is not because of a lack of time. Two weeks is not going to help. The problem is the substance of the bill.

The bill provides massive tax cuts for the wealthy, and, just as bad, if not worse, it puts a dagger in the heart of the Medicaid Program, which has become a program that affects so many Americans. With kids—poor kids—is where it started, but now it affects people who have Mom and Dad in a nursing home and who might face thousands of dollars of expenses, those on opioid treatment, those who have kids with disabilities, and many, many, many with preexisting conditions. Those are all helped by Medicaid, and our Republican colleagues here want to slash it.

Just like my colleague from Florida, I was in some very conservative parts in New York State, places that voted for Trump by over 60 percent. The revulsion—"revulsion" is the word—and the fear that this healthcare bill has put in the hearts of those folks in Republican areas are dramatic.

So I would say to my good friend the leader that we are willing to stay as

long as he wants, but he is not going to solve his problem until he abandons tax cuts on the rich, abandons the decimation of Medicaid, and works with us to improve the existing law. His problem and our Republican colleagues' problem is not time. It is the substance of the bill.

I will say one more thing. If I were a Republican, I would not want to go home either. Every time they go home, they are lambasted because the American people have such a negative feeling about the bill. So, of course, they would want to stay here, but that is not the answer. The answer is to change the bill. Work with us. We have been begging, pleading, asking, cajoling for a month or two, when it was clear their bill was going to fail. I would say that is very important.

Mr. President, I heard the majority leader complain about the slow pace of nominations.

Our Republican friends, when they are worried about the slow pace of nominations, ought to look in the mirror. This President has nominated fewer nominees than has anyone else, and seven of the major nominees had to withdraw their nominations. Many of them were brought here to the Senate without the necessary documentation—the paperwork, the ethics reports, the FBI reports. The chaos in the White House is now spreading to the Republican Senate. Our President seems to blame somebody else when his administration makes a mess. Let's not do that here.

Again, the number of nominees that this President has submitted is lower than that of any President's in recent memory. My colleague complained about this nominee from Idaho. He was outraged that he had to file cloture. I would remind the majority leader that this district judge was nominated by President Obama in the last Congress and that he was the majority leader in the last Congress, which was responsible for putting nominees on the Senate calendar. The district court judge is only one of many nominees who the Republicans failed to move in the last Congress—a Congress which confirmed the fewest number of judges of any Congress since the Eisenhower administration. That goes to show how desperate our Republican leadership is to shift blame and attention away from its healthcare bill to hypocritical and preposterous complaints on nominations. It is in order to distract from the healthcare bill. They can try other tactics.

On one more point, I would remind my colleagues that it is the majority leader who has the power to put nominees on the floor. In the Department of Defense, we have been asked about three nominees. Leader MCCONNELL has the power to put them on the floor—instead of this judge from Idaho, instead of the nominee for OMB, and instead of the Ambassador to Japan—tomorrow, if he chose. It is his choice. If he puts them on the floor—these Defense nomi-

nees—in regular order next week, they will be approved.

So, again, to deflect from healthcare and the mess our poor Republican colleagues are in, to point falsely at the nomination process, which has been slow-walked by President Trump and many of the committees, is not going to succeed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, from the moment President Trump and Republicans began trying to jam TrumpCare through Congress, I heard from family after family in my home State about the damage their efforts to undermine families' healthcare would do, and this last week was no different. Again and again, my constituents told me what a difference it makes to have affordable insurance, to know that benefits like substance abuse treatment are covered, or to worry about how they would manage if TrumpCare ever became law.

I heard some of my Republican colleagues went out of their way to avoid those kinds of stories when they were home, so I wanted to make sure they heard a few examples now that they are back in town. And I appreciate that many of my Democratic colleagues will also be sharing stories they heard from their constituents over the past few days.

Like many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I come from a State in which the opioid epidemic has had a devastating impact. It has been both heartbreaking and inspiring to talk with patients and families who are doing everything they can to fight back. Right now, the message I am getting from them loud and clear is that they do not want TrumpCare.

Daniel, one of my constituents, was injured in the military. He was given a prescription for painkillers. He was on them for 8 years, and he told me that during that time, his three daughters wondered why he wouldn't play with them. Eventually, Daniel changed doctors and was prescribed Suboxone, which made all the difference for him. He is now able to work again. He manages a grocery store. He relies on Medicaid for healthcare coverage, which covers the hundreds of dollars a month his prescriptions cost. Daniel told me that if he loses Medicaid under TrumpCare, he will not be able to make ends meet and all of the progress he has made will be threatened.

I heard from a constituent named Rachel of Seattle who was addicted to opioids and living in her car when she found out she was eligible for Medicaid. She got connected with Swedish Medical Center in Seattle, where she received wraparound health services, in-

cluding mental healthcare and primary healthcare. Now she and her husband are successfully in recovery. They are raising a family, and Rachel is going to school. But, just like Daniel, they do not know what they will do if TrumpCare becomes law and the Medicaid coverage that is keeping them going is taken away.

Those are just two of the countless stories I heard from patients and families and doctors in my home State and nationwide. I have heard from cancer survivors who have fought back as hard as they can and are worried that TrumpCare will allow insurance companies to price them out of care because they are now labeled with a pre-existing condition. I heard from young parents of medically fragile children who stay up at night worrying about how to afford care for their toddler if lifetime caps on coverage are imposed under TrumpCare. I heard from seniors who simply don't have the savings to cover the premium spikes TrumpCare would cost. I heard from women and men who are furious, and rightly so, that a group of 13 men wrote a bill in secret to defund Planned Parenthood—the Nation's largest provider of women's healthcare—removing a quality, affordable provider from communities in which it is now very difficult to get care.

These stories are powerful. They make it undeniably clear just how much TrumpCare would hurt people. So it is no wonder that Senate Republicans spent the last week lying low and avoiding defending, oddly, the indefensible. Senate Republicans have read the same independent Congressional Budget Office analysis as we all have. They have heard from countless doctors and nurses and hospitals and nursing homes and patient advocates about all of the ways TrumpCare would raise families' costs and take away coverage. They know that people across the country are completely, resoundingly rejecting TrumpCare. It is the least popular bill in three decades, according to one study.

All in all, TrumpCare shatters every promise President Trump and Republicans made about providing insurance to everybody and making sure no one is worse off. And, incredibly, the extreme rightwing still thinks it leaves too much of the Affordable Care Act intact.

Even though it seems one would be hard-pressed to find anyone who wants to stick up for TrumpCare—including, by the way, President Trump—Senate Republican leaders are still doing everything they can to jam this through Congress as quickly as they can. They are working on backroom deals as we speak and coming up with new ways to sweeten the deal for Senate Republicans who are rightly wary of voting for a bill that would so clearly do so much harm.

In particular, this afternoon I wanted to address the ongoing effort by extreme conservative Senators to double

down on pulling the rug out from under patients with preexisting conditions. They put together this two-track plan to make middle-class workers and families pay more. If they get their way, insurance companies would be back in charge and could tell patients with pre-existing conditions or anyone who happens to get sick in the middle of the year “tough luck,” and they will do that in a way that even conservative experts predict will cause premiums and deductibles to skyrocket. Senate Republicans are coming up with other ideas, too, such as an opioid fund that a Republican Governor said is like “spitting in the ocean.”

Let me be clear. There is no “fixing” TrumpCare. No tweak around the edges is going to turn TrumpCare—which, by the way, is just a tax break for special interests and the healthcare industry on the backs of patients—into a healthcare bill that actually helps people. There is just no way. TrumpCare, as the President said, is mean at its core, and unless it is dropped altogether, Senate Republicans are going to have to decide whether they stand with their party or the people they came here to represent.

So to everyone out there who has called and written and rallied and tweeted, you are having an impact. You are why TrumpCare isn't already law. But you cannot give up now, and Democrats here in the Senate won't either. We are going to keep doing everything we can to make sure Senate Republicans can't hold their noses and vote for TrumpCare just to hand big corporations a tax break and President Trump a hollow political win, whether it is next week or the weeks into August.

I also want to remind my Senate Republican colleagues again that we have made clear all along the way that there is a better way to do this. Democrats are ready. We are willing to work with you on policies that make healthcare more affordable and workable for patients and families.

So I am here today to say I hope you all listen to the stories our Democratic colleagues are bringing to the floor. Think about how devastating TrumpCare would be, and do the right thing. Drop this mean bill once and for all so all of us can get to work on real healthcare solutions that actually help people afford care, get covered, and stay healthy. If you do, you won't have to defend this defenseless bill a minute longer.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to thank Senator MURRAY, a member of our leadership, for taking this time to talk about accounts from home, what we have heard from those we have the honor to represent, and I think this is exactly what is appropriate at the beginning of this work period.

I just come off of eight open-to-all townhall meetings in my home State of

Oregon. Five were in counties won by President Trump, three were in counties won by Hillary Clinton, and the single unifying issue that dominated each one is that TrumpCare is a loser. Across the political spectrum—Democrats, Republicans, liberals, and conservatives—what I was told is that the Congress ought to set this TrumpCare bill aside, that the one MITCH MCCONNELL has been working on ought to be dropped, and after it is dropped, Democrats and Republicans ought to get together and look for the common ground by trying to show some common sense.

I am going to spend a little time talking about what I heard, what people are concerned about, and then briefly talk about, as Senator MURRAY said, what we would like to do if our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will drop this ill-advised, “our way or the highway” approach and do what the Senate has traditionally done when we are talking about tackling a big issue, which is find common ground.

It doesn't get much bigger than healthcare. We are spending \$3.2 trillion each year now on healthcare. It comes to something like \$10,000 for every man, woman, and child. We are spending enough money; the real question is whether we spend it in the right place, and this very flawed TrumpCare bill will compound that problem.

During those eight townhall meetings over the past week, Oregonians asked me: When is this flawed TrumpCare bill coming to a vote? How are my frail, not physically well, older parents supposed to get by if this bill passes and they lose their health care coverage?

As I have talked about with Senator MURRAY, we know that Medicaid picks up the bill for what amounts to two out of three older people in nursing homes. What often is not mentioned is that it also covers home- and community-based services for seniors. I remember from my days as director of the Oregon Gray Panthers that the whole goal was to create this continuum of choices for older people and, as Senator MURRAY touched on, the older people who need nursing homes and nursing home benefits. She is absolutely right. We also need to protect the Medicaid guarantee for the seniors for whom care is appropriate in other settings, such as home- and community-based services.

At those townhall meetings at community centers and auditoriums, folks knew that I am the senior Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee.

We have another talented member from the committee, Senator BENNET, here, as well as my knowledgeable colleague from Oregon, Senator MERKLEY.

I have worked on these issues with respect to taxes and healthcare for some time, and I have really dedicated my professional life to trying to find that common ground, show common sense in the areas of healthcare and taxes. But the fact is, this version of TrumpCare is a tax break for some of

the most powerful special interests masquerading as a health plan, and when Oregonians heard that, whether it was in a Trump county or in a Clinton county, everybody started nodding.

The secret is out. This is not a plan to fix anybody's healthcare or hold down the premiums; this is one big handout to the most powerful special interests. People heard that Republicans were saying those tax cuts were going to create jobs. That is not very likely when they have made the tax cuts retroactive. What that means—they made the big one retroactive to January 1—is that if you have a capital gain say in March, and if this bill is passed in its present form, if that capital gain is \$1 million, you get a tax break of \$38,000. That is not creating jobs, it is creating windfalls, and the American people have caught on.

Now that the Senate is back in session, the public is reading about the newest proposal on offer. It is a Hail Mary pass from Senator CRUZ and Republican leaders, trying to put together \$50 billion for their version of TrumpCare. And we know in the Finance Committee, they have billions and billions of dollars that they can use to try to find those extra votes.

I will tell you, this Senator CRUZ proposal as it relates to healthcare is a prescription for mayhem in the private health insurance marketplace. It is going to mean misery for so many Americans dealing with illnesses. Forget the talk about bringing costs down. This plan is going to send health expenses into the stratosphere.

The plan tells insurance companies: You are off the hook as it relates to basic consumer protections. You get to bring back annual and lifetime caps on coverage.

Think about that. In the State of Alabama and everywhere else in America under the Affordable Care Act, the 160 million people who get their care through their employer heard about this bill and said: We are home free. It really does not affect us. They got a little extra bonus. The Affordable Care Act gave them a major catastrophic benefit if they had that employer coverage. With this Republican bill, all of those folks who thought they were home free with the employer coverage should know that once again there would be limits on what insurance companies could pay.

I will tell you, for anyone who is listening to this, if someone gets cancer at home, they are going to bust that cap in a hurry. This bill means they are not automatically protected. You can forget about essential health benefits. You get to flood the market with bargain-basement insurance plans as long as you offer one comprehensive option, and you get to price that plan through the roof.

If you pass this bill—the Cruz fantasy proposal—it is going to be a tale of two health symptoms. The young and healthy will opt for the barebones insurance plans that don't cover much of

anything, but there are millions of people in the country who can't get by, can't make it with skimpy insurance that covers nothing but stitches and aromatherapy.

There are people who have had a cancer scare or suffer from diabetes or people who get hurt on the ski slopes or slip off a ladder. The only coverage that works for them will come with an astronomical price tag.

By the way, the people between 55 and 64, who can get charged five times as much as younger people, get fewer tax credits under this Republican proposal. They can't get by with skimpy coverage. A lot of them have really serious health problems. Skimpy coverage for them is just a prescription for trouble.

The fact is, this new proposal basically starts marching America back to the days when healthcare was reserved for the healthy and wealthy. What I will say is that there would be plenty of opportunities for Democrats and Republicans to find common ground if this proposal is set aside.

Nobody has said the Affordable Care Act is perfect. What we would do is go to work to stabilize the private insurance market. That would be business No. 1. We would look at ideas, as Senator NELSON has just thoughtfully outlined, like reinsurance. Then a special priority of mine is to clamp down on skyrocketing prescription drug prices. I think there are a number of ideas that are teed up for both sides to come together.

I recently put in a bill called the SPIKE bill. What it says is that these big drug companies should have to justify their big price hikes. I don't think that is an extreme position to say they ought to have to publicly, justifiably make it part of the public record.

In the last few years, we have had a whole new industry emerge. They represent States and companies and labor unions, and they are supposed to be negotiating a good deal for patients. They are called pharmaceutical benefit managers, but we don't know what they put in their pocket and what they put in our pocket.

I have said: How about some transparency, folks? Sunlight is the best disinfectant.

Those are the kinds of ideas—reinsurance, stabilizing the private insurance market, clamping down on prescription drug prices, particularly using the power in the marketplace—that both sides ought to be able to get together.

The recess is over, but the healthcare debate is far from over. What I will say is what I told my constituents. I see my friend Senator MERKLEY here. We had rallies at home. I said: Folks, in stopping the McConnell bill before the July break, you proved that political change in America is not trickle-down; it is bottom-up.

For weeks before that July break, Americans of all ages and political philosophies called and texted and wrote and came to rallies and town meetings.

They said: This TrumpCare bill is a loser for us. It doesn't work. Drop it and move on to approaches that involve common sense. Look for common ground that both sides could support. It is absolutely vital.

The events of the last few weeks have shown the power of the grassroots. I walked through for my constituents what could have happened if 2 weeks ago the Republican leader had brought his bill to the floor. It was in the morning. I described how the bill could have gotten through the Senate. Maybe the House would have stayed in; maybe the House would have passed it; maybe the President would have signed it. One of my constituents said that morning: If that had happened and we had lost the ACA, even though it is not perfect, that morning we would have been in mourning.

Let us show today that we can tackle this in a way that the Senate historically has worked best. Let's block the deeply flawed bill, and then let's turn around immediately to show that we can come together, find common ground.

I see one of our colleagues, the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who has one of the important reinsurance bills here. We have a variety of ideas that we can pursue, that I think would have appeal on both sides of the aisle, but there is a step you have to take before you get on to those commonsense ideas. You have to stop the flawed bill before the U.S. Senate at this point.

I ask the people of this country to continue what they have done over the last few weeks and show political change, bottom-up rather than top-down.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I thank the ranking member of the Finance Committee for his leadership not only on this bill but also healthcare over the decades. He knows something about the right way of doing it and the wrong way of doing it, which is partly what brings me to the floor today.

I want to say something that I think will be uncontroversial to the people at home but may be news to some people here, and that is whether you support the Affordable Care Act or whether you don't support the Affordable Care Act, whether you have been a supporter of ObamaCare or whether you are not a supporter of what is called ObamaCare, in general, people are pretty dissatisfied with our healthcare system at home. In general, people are pretty dissatisfied with the rate their insurance goes up. They are pretty dissatisfied with the fact that a lot of people are still uncovered in this country. If they are a senior, they are pretty dissatisfied not just with the idea but with the practice that month after month, people have to cut their medicines in half just to get through the month. They are pretty dissatisfied with the fact that they call an insurance company to

make a claim to say "My child was sick" and point out that month after month they have paid their premiums only to find that on the day they make that claim, there is someone at that insurance company who has more time than they do to stay on the phone, to keep them on that phone, to deny them their claim. They are pretty dissatisfied about that.

As a whole, I think the American people are dissatisfied by the fact that we spend 16 percent of our gross domestic product, our entire economy, on healthcare when every other industrialized country in the world spends half of that or less than half of that on healthcare and—this is going to come as news to some people in this Chamber—get better results. We are moving in the wrong direction on too many dimensions when it comes to our healthcare.

I have said all of that as a proponent of the Affordable Care Act. I spent a year and a half in Colorado, in certain places, being called a Bolshevik or a socialist, being accused of advocating for a government takeover of our healthcare system. This was at a time when the tea party was very active, and people would come and say, quite rightly: Read the bill. Read the bill. We need to take our government back.

We tried to do some things to help in that bill. For the first time in the country's history, we tried to say that it wasn't OK to discriminate against people who were sick or have what is called a preexisting condition when they went to buy health insurance. As the Senator from Oregon said, it wasn't OK that if you did get sick when you had insurance and you got something like cancer that an insurance company could just throw you off their rolls because you hit their cap.

We said that we thought it wasn't OK that there were millions of people, many of them children, who didn't have access to primary care; that is, a doctor to be able to give you a checkup and see how you are doing so that you weren't getting treated in the emergency room—the most expensive, least intentional way of running a healthcare system that is imaginable. In fact, I would say that is the Bolshevik way of running a healthcare system: When you are sick, you get to show up at the emergency room, and somebody is going to take care of you. It gives you the results of a Bolshevik system because you are paying more for less of an outcome.

We tried to address some of those things, and that became the Affordable Care Act. That became ObamaCare. That became something that was politicized for 7 years, as the House of Representatives cynically, month after month, voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Then the majority of the House went home to their districts and said: We repealed ObamaCare. We voted to repeal ObamaCare.

You didn't repeal it.

No, we voted to repeal it. If you send me back there next week, I will do the

same thing. I will do it the week after that.

Then at some point, people started to say: Well, you keep having the vote on repealing ObamaCare. Why haven't you actually done it?

They said: Well, we didn't have the Senate.

They have had the Senate now for two Congresses.

Well, we didn't have the Presidency.

Now we have the same party in Presidency, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. This terrible bill we are considering is not a bill that anybody—that is an exaggeration—virtually anybody in my State supports or has asked for. That is what we have in front of us.

I know somebody else who knew that the American people were dissatisfied with their healthcare system, and that was Donald J. Trump when he was running for President of the United States.

I hope, in particular, the people who voted for the President, as a way of keeping Washington accountable, will remember that he said he was going to provide the American people “a terrific plan,” to “cover everyone at a fraction of the cost.” The President, when he was running—he still does it—was very fond of talking about—his words—how stupid everybody in Washington was and he knew how to make deals and he was going to come here and make great deals and he was going to cover everybody at a fraction of the price with a terrific plan. That is what he promised the American people. That is what he was peddling when he was running for President. He said: “Everybody is going to be taken care of much better than you are taken care of now.” That is what he said. This isn't fake news. This isn't CNN or the New York Times or the Wall Street Journal or whoever is in the crosshairs. This is what the President said on the campaign trail when he was running because he detected, quite rightly, that the American people are unhappy with the way our healthcare system works—unhappy in the richest country of the world to have a healthcare system where people have to make decisions about their lives and about their children's lives that no one in the industrialized world has to make about their lives or their children's lives—and they wonder why.

I think the diagnosis has a lot to do with what some people have said, which is special interests having a grasp on Washington, DC. That is what the President said he was going to give to the American people. This is what his promise was to the American people. What did we get instead? We have a bill passed by the House that was a massive tax cut for the richest people in America, which, literally, nobody in my townhalls in red or blue parts of my State has ever said is something that would help with their healthcare. Not a single person has said what they want for healthcare is a massive tax cut for people making more than \$250,000 a year—not one, not one person.

There is a 25-percent cut to Medicaid in this bill. That was done in the name of, I guess, reforming entitlements. The argument has been made that there are a lot of lazy people who are on Medicaid, and if you cut Medicaid by 25 percent, they will go to work, and they should go to work. Well, there are two issues with that. The first is, it is important to understand who is on Medicaid.

In my State, 50 percent of the people are children. Are they supposed to be at work or can they go to school? Then there are a whole bunch of people on Medicaid—in fact, it is a very large share of the population of Medicaid who have spent their entire life savings down for the privilege of being in a nursing home paid for by Medicaid. Are they supposed to work? Then there are a lot of people—I am ashamed to say this—there are a lot of people in this country who are working one job, two jobs and can't make enough money to buy private insurance in the United States of America. That is a shame. Do they need to get a third or fourth job before we are saying they are not lazy or should we fix this healthcare system so it is more affordable, more predictable, more transparent for American families? Those were the promises the President made. That is the content of the bill with one addition. They slipped in—between that tax cut and that 25-percent cut to Medicaid, which is paying for that tax cut for the wealthiest Americans—what my colleague RAND PAUL, a Republican from Kentucky, has described accurately as ObamaCare lite. He is absolutely right about that. If you hate ObamaCare, you will hate ObamaCare lite. If you are looking in a rural part of my State or the country, and you already can't afford insurance because there is no market there and you can't get a subsidy that will help you because you are making too much money, you are going to hate that even more. Wait until they pass the Cruz amendment, which he is calling the freedom amendment—freedom to have to endure something no one else in the industrialized world has to put up with, which is buying lousy insurance that doesn't cover anything. You can create the worst product in the world and make it affordable. That is not hard to do.

We have come a long way from Franklin Roosevelt's four freedoms, if we are talking about the freedom of insurance companies to be able to throw you off if you hit the lifetime cap, freedom not to give you insurance if you have a preexisting condition. We have come a long, long way.

Finally, my colleagues are here so I am going to stop. I do want to say one word about the process. The majority leader today announced that he is going to keep the Senate in for 2 weeks in August because they have to finish their work on healthcare or maybe it is 3 weeks in August. I don't care if it is a month. I don't care if they cancel every recess we have between now and

the end of the year. I don't care if we work on weekends if it will create a situation where we can actually improve healthcare for the American people. I am glad to stay. In fact, I think we should stay, but, unfortunately, that is not what he is trying to do. What he is trying to do is jam through a bill that is incredibly unpopular with the American people. That is why, until 2 weeks ago, it was a secret. Until two Thursdays ago, it was a secret.

I have to suspect that one reason they want to keep us in August is because they don't want to go home because they were just beaten to death over the July 4th recess because people came out in Republican and Democratic parts of their States and said: Are you out of your minds? This bill has nothing to do with our healthcare. They probably don't want to repeat that in August.

I will close just by saying this, and I said this again to the people who came to my townhalls and were highly critical of the Affordable Care Act and the process: I want to remind you folks that back then—the Senator from Oregon will remember this—back then, we spent over a year debating that bill here in the Congress. We had countless—somebody could count them up—but countless committee hearings in the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee and the Finance Committee. We had almost 200 amendments that were Republican amendments that were adopted as part of that bill. Everybody remembers, no Republican voted for it, but there were 200 Republican amendments adopted as part of that bill. We have not had a single committee hearing in the Senate about this healthcare bill—not one.

So you can keep us in for 2 weeks or 3 weeks longer in August, but a better idea might be to follow the regular order around this place. Talk about take our country back, take our government back, make it work, have hearings, have witnesses. I can think of 100 Coloradans, off the top of my head, who would like to come here and testify. I would even say 50 of them can be Republicans and 50 of them can be Democrats. Have them come testify what would make healthcare better for them. That is what this should be about: families all across this country who are struggling because of our healthcare system and who need relief from this Congress and who so far aren't getting it.

I will close just by saying, if the President could submit a proposal that actually would meet the criteria he set out when he was running for President—instead of having a bill he couldn't pass with even 51 Republican votes—he would have a bill he could pass with 100 votes here in the Senate, and that is what we should strive to do.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, let's revisit recent history. Four weeks ago,

my Republican colleagues were meeting secretly in this building, in a hallway that the press was not allowed in because they didn't want to have the press see them sneaking in and sneaking out of this completely undemocratic process—13 Republican men crafting a healthcare plan to destroy healthcare for 22 million Americans. That is where we were 4 weeks ago.

We made a big deal out of the fact that is not the way a Congress is supposed to operate. You are supposed to have committee hearings. You are supposed to have committee debate and invite experts in. You are supposed to have time to consult with your constituents back home, but none of that was happening. No, we had the Republican zero-zero-zero process: Zero committee meetings. How does that compare to more than 100 committee meetings and roundtables and walkthroughs from 8 years ago? Zero committee amendments. How does that compare to more than 400 amendments that were considered 8 years ago and more than 100 minority amendments, Republican amendments, that were adopted in this process? Zero exposure of the bill to the folks back home and to the healthcare stakeholders.

Then, 2 weeks ago, we had a draft, and we had a chance to circulate that draft and get a few folks from home to weigh in on what it looked like. We received a CBO analysis. Yes, it looked a lot like the House bill. The House bill was going to eliminate 14 million healthcare policies in a year, and the Senate was going to best that by eliminating healthcare for 15 million Americans and 22 million Americans over a 10-year period.

The President had called the House bill mean, but we had the even meaner Senate bill. Fortunately, we were able to create such a fuss that the majority leader canceled the vote—the vote that was going to take place with the zero committee hearings and zero amendments and that would give my colleagues the opportunity to go home and talk to their constituents. But what happened?

Well, in the course of this entire year, two-thirds of my Republican colleagues haven't held a single townhall, and last week, when they had a full opportunity to finally take their secret 13 bill—zero-zero-zero bill—and ask their constituents what they thought, they didn't hold townhalls. By best count, 2 Senators across the aisle held a townhall out of 52.

Why are my colleagues so terrified of their constituents? Is it because wiping out health insurance for struggling Americans is a travesty? Is it because wiping out healthcare for working Americans is a crime—a crime against decency? Is it because their bill proceeds to give \$33 billion to the richest 400 Americans? No, that is not \$33,000 or \$33 million, that is \$33 billion to the richest 400 Americans—more than several hundred billion dollars to the richest Americans overall. You know, the

money they want to give to the top 400 richest Americans would fund healthcare for more than 700,000 Americans under Medicaid.

Well, I went home. I went to a lot of places. I went to three cities in what you might call blue Oregon. I went to 13 towns in what can clearly be called red Oregon—predominantly Republican Oregon. I went to towns like Echo and Helix; Adams and Athena; Weston and Sumpter; Granite and Greenhorn, with 37 individuals; and Adams, with a population of 348. I went to larger towns like North Powder and Wallowa; and Baker City, Burns and Nyssa.

In six of those Republican towns, I held full townhalls, and what did I hear? I heard that the top concern was healthcare because constituents in red America across this country are terrified of the secret 13's bill and all that it involves. What would it do in my home State? Well, 400,000 Oregonians under the Oregon Health Plan would lose their care. At least another 100,000 would lose their care because of the changes in the way the exchange operates. They kind of put their minds to work at what the picture looks like from the draft the Republicans were willing to circulate after we applied extensive pressure. And what did we hear? Well, we heard that they are very concerned about extinguishing the expansion of Medicaid. Those are folks who are working hard but struggling, often in multiple part-time jobs.

We heard about the fact that Medicaid pays for more than two out of three individuals on long-term care in rural America. In fact, I went to one nursing home and asked: Does Medicaid—Oregon Health Plan—pay for two-thirds of your residents?

They said: No, Senator. Here in Klamath Falls, it is nearly 100 percent.

Realize that an individual who is getting paid-for, long-term care under Medicaid has to have assets of less than \$2,000. So there is no backup plan. You wipe out healthcare for those 400,000 individuals who are on expanded Medicaid, many of whom are in long-term care, and they have no backup plan.

One woman, Debra, said to me: Senator, I am paid for by Medicaid, and if they cut Medicaid, I will be out on the street. That will be a problem because I can't walk.

That is right, Debra, you are in trouble, and so is every other individual who is funded through Medicaid for long-term care.

What about maternity care? One out of three individuals in rural Oregon and rural America who is preparing to have a baby is funded through Medicaid. Children and the disabled are funded through Medicaid.

What do we get as an alternative now that the Republicans are back, having ducked their constituents? They want a new plan to offer? Well, they are talking about the Cruz plan. Now, this is interesting. It is a plan that says an insurance company can offer policies

that cover nothing as long as they have at least one policy that covers quite a bit, which means the young and the healthy buy the policy that covers almost nothing, and then the policy that covers quite a bit that older Americans and those with preexisting conditions need becomes incredibly expensive because the group in that pool are people with lots of healthcare problems, and it creates a death spiral in insurance.

Well, at the one end of the spectrum, you have a death spiral for insurance policies that cover a lot; at the other end of the spectrum, you have fake insurance because it covers virtually nothing. Oh, maybe it only costs \$50 a month. Oh, isn't that wonderful—until you find out it doesn't cover a day in the hospital; doesn't cover a trip to the emergency room; doesn't cover maternity care; doesn't cover drugs. In fact, it doesn't cover anything.

Why is it that a President who is so concerned about fake news is so interested in supporting fake insurance?

My constituents back home told me a lot of stories. These are stories that I hope to share in the next couple of days, but right now, I think it is important that we hear from my colleague from Virginia, Senator TIM Kaine, because he has also been looking in detail at this bill. He also understands what a devastating consequence TrumpCare will have for American healthcare.

Can't we come together with a better vision? Can't we come together and make the marketplace work better, restore the reinsurance that has ripped apart the ability of insurance companies to go into new markets? Can't we restore the cost-sharing payments that buy down the premiums, in fact improve them, so there are lower premiums and lower deductibles? Can't we come together and do a better job of funding opioid treatment? Can't we come together and take on the high costs of drugs in general, which is driving costs in the healthcare system? Just those four things would be something very positive to make our current healthcare system even better.

Let's work together to make healthcare here in the United States of America even better, not tear it down and destroy it, as is being proposed by my Republican colleagues.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I also rise to talk about the healthcare proposal on the floor, and I thank my colleague from Oregon and all my colleagues who have taken the floor on this issue.

I will just state at the top a punch line: I will vote for any healthcare bill that meets President Trump's promises. He said that in his replacement, no one would lose coverage, no one would pay more, no one would get kicked around because of a preexisting condition, and he wouldn't cut Medicaid. And any bill that meets those criteria, I am voting for, but I won't

vote for a bill that shatters all those promises, and that is what this current proposal does.

There is a lot to talk about with the bill, and I just want to talk about one thing—the proposed cuts to the Medicaid Program and especially the effect of those cuts on children.

In the current Senate proposal, which is being sort of adjusted and modified, there is a slashing of Medicaid by about \$770 billion over 10 years. And if you add to that additional cuts to Medicaid proposed by the President's budget, we are now north of \$1 trillion of cuts to Medicaid in the next 10 years.

Who receives Medicaid? In Virginia, between 50 and 60 percent of those who receive Medicaid are children. In Virginia, 600,000 young people are Medicaid recipients.

If you go to school and you are receiving an individualized education plan because you have a designated disability, Medicaid is paying for it.

About 50 percent of childbirths in Virginia are paid for by Medicaid.

If you are a kid who is doing everything right, but your family is dysfunctional and a juvenile court judge has to decide whether to keep you with your family or put you in a group home, if the judge decides to send a social worker to your house 5 hours a week, Medicaid pays for that.

If you are a child with autism and you are getting services for your autism after school so you can succeed in school, Medicaid pays for that.

In Virginia, 600,000 children receive Medicaid.

We recently had the administration's OMB—Office of Management and Budget—Director, Mick Mulvaney, before us, and I asked him about these Medicaid cuts. These cuts are catastrophic. How can you say these cuts are a good thing? This is his quote:

We are no longer going to measure compassion by the number of programs or the number of people on programs like Medicaid. We are going to measure compassion . . . by the number of people we get off those programs and back in charge of their own lives.

So the philosophy that drives this is, we want to get people off Medicaid and back in charge of their own lives—600,000 kids.

I had a roundtable yesterday in Springfield, VA, here in Northern Virginia, and I had five families, parents and children, come to talk about what Medicaid cuts would mean to them.

Angie and Anna are from Haymarket, VA. Anna is a little 5-year-old and, her mom says, typical in so many ways. She loves to play with her brothers, and she loves to play with dolls. But she has cerebral palsy and tracheal bronchial malacia and subglottic stenosis and chronic lung disease. In 2014, she developed a condition that caused her to have 30 bone breaks in 18 months.

Anna is in school. Anna is in school with a wheelchair that Medicaid pays for. Anna is in school with some home

health that Medicaid pays for. Medicaid enables this child who has so many needs to actually go to school so she can be all that she can be. Her family has TRICARE through the military because the dad is in the military, but they couldn't make it without Medicaid.

Jen and Cailyn are from Sterling, VA, also in Northern Virginia. Cailyn is about 9½. Within a week after she was born, the family knew there were some things wrong. She was finally diagnosed at age 3½ with a very rare, noninherited genetic anomaly. The family was able to get her qualified for a Medicaid waiver when she was about a year old. And this is secondary insurance. The family works and they have private insurance, but it doesn't cover a wheelchair, a hospital bed, and things that she needs to succeed. Again, this little girl who is 9½—and her mother testified that she functions on about the range of a 6-month old—she is able to go to school because Medicaid can pay for some of the technology she needs.

Kim and Isaac are from Ashburn, VA, in Loudoun County. Isaac is a youngster, a very active kid, but he has a tracheotomy. He is feeding-tube dependent. His family has private insurance, but they couldn't get along without Medicaid. He is in the Loudoun County schools succeeding because of Medicaid.

Dylan is another kid in Loudoun County schools. Corinne is his mother. Dylan has a rare neuromuscular disease called spinal muscular atrophy with respiratory distress. He has a tracheotomy tube. He relies on a ventilator to breathe. Little Dylan was at this meeting. The family has private insurance, but they couldn't succeed without Medicaid. Dylan is able to go to school because of Medicaid.

Finally, there is a family from Richmond—Amy is the mom, and the son is Declan. Declan is not in school because he is only 18 months old. He has cerebral palsy, and his medical needs are intense. With Medicaid, he is able to get some home nursing help, and he is able to get some machinery at home that helps him succeed.

These are beautiful parents, one of whom had adopted her child—first as a foster care and then adopted knowing the special needs of this child. This was Angie and Anna. These parents are the saints of the world, and these kids are fighting so hard. They are fighting so hard just to try to develop every talent they have, every capacity they have, but with Medicaid cuts, they would be in deep, deep jeopardy.

Why would we vote for a bill that slashes Medicaid to families like these when President Trump said we are not going to cut Medicaid? Why would we vote for a bill that shatters those promises, that takes health insurance away from 20 million people, that increases premiums for seniors, that subjects those with preexisting conditions to being cast in the shadows yet again? That is what this bill would do.

I had a conclusion written, but I will tell you, one of my moms yesterday gave me a better one. She gave me a better conclusion.

We had this roundtable with five families. We had some great folks from the American Academy of Pediatricians who were there, too, saying what a bad bill this would be for kids.

After the hearing was over, one of the moms looked at me and said: You know, they kind of picked the wrong group of people to fight with—talking about this bill.

I said: What you do mean by that, wrong group of people to fight with?

She said: Parents of kids with disabilities.

I said: I don't get where you are going.

And this is what she said to me: From the moment our children are born, all we do is fight. We fight so that our kids can survive. We fight so that our kids can have as normal a life as possible. We have to fight with hospitals. We have to fight with insurance companies. We have to fight with school systems. We have to fight with cultural stigmas about people with disabilities. If you are a parent of a child with a disability, from the day they are born, all you do is fight. And if they think that we are going to pass a bill to cut Medicaid to these kids and their families and that we are not going to fight about it, that we are not going to stand up and be heard, they have seriously underestimated us.

I think we can do the right thing, as my colleagues have said, if we will get together. I am on the HELP Committee, Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and the only topic that has been taboo on my committee this year is health. We have had hearings about nominees. We have had hearings about the FDA. We have not been allowed to have a hearing about this health proposal—either the House bill or the Senate bill.

Let's have a hearing, listen to patients, listen to parents, listen to hospitals, listen to doctors, listen to people who are worried about their premium costs, listen to insurance companies, and listen to medical innovators. If we listen, we will get this right. But if we shut down a process, if we don't allow the public in, don't listen, don't have hearings, and rush it through, we will get it wrong.

This is the biggest sector of the American economy, and it is the most important expenditure that anybody ever makes in their life. On behalf of the 600,000 children in Virginia and the 30 million children in this country who receive Medicaid, let's get this right.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleague, Senator RISCH, to speak on the nomination of Judge David Nye to be a U.S. district judge for the Federal district of Idaho.

First, let me acknowledge the diligent work of Judiciary Committee

Chairman GRASSLEY and Ranking Member FEINSTEIN in expediting the confirmation process for Judge Nye's renomination.

I also thank both President Obama and President Trump for nominating Judge Nye to the Federal bench. It is rare to be nominated by Presidents of two different parties, but it is a fitting testament to Judge Nye's sterling reputation that he has secured that distinction.

Finally, I appreciate the majority leader giving Judge Nye the honor of being the first U.S. district judge by the 115th Congress.

Judge Nye is supremely qualified as a candidate for the Federal district court seat, having a unanimous "well qualified" rating from the American Bar Association and having received approval from the Senate Judiciary Committee without dissent twice in a little less than a year.

Judge Nye has long been ready to assume this high office. A longtime member of Idaho's legal community, Judge Nye has been a law clerk, a practicing lawyer, and since 2007 a judge on Idaho's Sixth Judicial District Court. This court handles all felony criminal cases, major civil cases, and appeals from the magistrate court from six counties throughout the southeast portion of Idaho. He also served from 2009 to 2012 as the administrative district judge for the Idaho Sixth Judicial District, elected by his peers on the court for the 3-year term to this position.

He is not just a well-respected jurist in Idaho. Judge Nye is heavily involved in the training and orientation of new Idaho judges, and he serves on the Idaho Supreme Court's committees on judicial education and felony sentencing.

Action on Judge Nye's nomination is critical and timely. Idaho is one of only three States having just two authorized district court judgeships. The nonpartisan Judicial Conference of the United States has declared a judicial emergency for Idaho and has recommended in every one of its reports to Congress since 2003 that Idaho be authorized a third district judge position. For the past 2 years, Idaho has had a three-judge caseload handled by just one active judge. What is even more challenging is that our lone remaining active judge is already eligible to take senior status since this past March. Even with Judge Nye's confirmation, Idaho still needs another U.S. district court judge.

Confirmation of Judge Nye today or tomorrow is undoubtedly a proud day for the entire Nye family, including Judge Nye's wife Katre and their eight children. Knowing that a successful public servant draws so much strength from the family surrounding him or her, I salute their partnership with Judge Nye in making this important occasion possible.

Again, I strongly endorse Judge Nye's nomination and appreciate the Senate's confirmation of him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the remarks from my distinguished colleague and close personal friend, Senator CRAPO, and join him in urging our fellow Senators to quickly confirm Judge Nye.

As pointed out by Senator CRAPO, this will be the first district judge to be confirmed by this Congress. So it should be an honor for Judge Nye, and I am sure he views it that way.

This has been, literally, years in the making. As Senator CRAPO pointed out, we have only one active Federal judge right now, and he is handling what is essentially a three-judge load. Some time ago, when this vacancy occurred, Senator CRAPO and I went to work on this. Most Americans don't understand how this works, but to become a U.S. district judge, it takes essentially the concurrence of three people—that is, the President of the United States and the two Senators from that particular State, be they two Republicans, two Democrats, or one of each—because we have what is called a blue slip process, where if any one of the three can and do object to a person, then that person will not be permitted to go forward.

In this particular case, we negotiated with the Obama White House for literally months and months, and it turned into years. I believe we acted in good faith on both sides in trying to find a person who would be the right fit for Idaho. Again, we literally vetted well over 50 individuals for this position, and for one reason or another, we were unable to get any of those across the finish line.

Finally, we settled on Judge Nye. I shouldn't say "settled" on him. He had not really applied. After going through the 50 being vetted and not really getting where we wanted to be, we sought out Judge Nye and talked with him about it, and we went forward on that basis. The White House came along, and before President Obama left office, he nominated Judge Nye, pursuant to my and Senator CRAPO's request. Unfortunately, that was just about the time that we ran out of time processing judges. The election came and went. President Trump was inaugurated, and we started all over again. I want to personally thank the White House for very quickly renominating Judge Nye for this position, again, at the request of myself and Senator CRAPO.

Too many States have a shortage of judges, and there is a movement afoot right now to attempt to boost the Federal judgeship load, which is in bad need. For instance, in the last seven surveys that the Judicial Conference has undertaken, they recommended that Idaho get a third judge. Senator CRAPO and my predecessor before me and, I think, even Senator CRAPO's predecessor before him have also been pushing for this judge. We continue to do that, and I am seeing some green sprouts that perhaps we will be moving somewhere in that direction.

In any event, yesterday we had the vote on moving forward on his nomination, and that vote was 97 to 0, which certainly is a testament to Judge Nye himself. I would urge our fellow Senators, when we get to this vote, which will either be later today or midday tomorrow, to proceed with the same kind of vote. It was a bipartisan vote on cloture, and we hope it will remain a bipartisan vote as we move forward on this confirmation.

With that, I want to thank Senator GRASSLEY, who obviously is pressed by everyone who has a vacancy, and Senator MCCONNELL, who has lots of things on his mind these days and is struggling with challenges that come at him from all directions, for choosing Judge Nye at our constant and gentle urging over the recent months and years and moving him to the front of the line. I want to personally thank Senator MCCONNELL for doing that. Of course, I want to thank my distinguished colleague for his work on the Judiciary Committee and moving it through the Judiciary Committee.

I think Judge Nye will be a person who will make us all proud. Certainly, we are going to be very happy to have this judgeship filled in Idaho and, particularly, with someone of the quality of Judge Nye.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as we move forward in our efforts to repeal and replace the failed ObamaCare law, it is worth remembering the reasons why this work is so urgent and why it is so important. The Affordable Care Act has left many American families paying far more for healthcare than they did beforehand, and it has taken away their freedom to choose the doctor they want or the health plan they want. That is, of course, all contrary to what was promised at the time ObamaCare was passed back in 2009 and 2010.

We all remember what the President said, and none of it has proven to be true in terms of your plan, your doctor, or the costs. In fact, as I mentioned before, the cost has gone up 105 percent for people in the individual market since 2013 alone. So rather than seeing a \$2,500 decrease in the cost to their health coverage, they have seen a \$3,000 increase, and the prices continue to go up. It is actually getting worse by the day, which is another reason for the urgency of what we are about to do. A report from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, or CMS, released yesterday, found that 40 percent fewer insurers have applied to participate in

the ObamaCare exchanges next year. The reason why that is important is because when fewer insurance companies choose to participate, of course, consumers have less choice and there is less competition in terms of quality of service or the price they charge. The damage goes far beyond the damage to the doctor-patient relationship and the damage to our pocketbooks, when we are told things will cost us less and they cost us more. The damage of the Affordable Care Act has literally permeated our entire economy and has led to a lot of people losing their jobs along the way.

ObamaCare consists of a number of mandates, government coercion, and punishment if you didn't comply with the mandates that forced many Americans to buy a product they would not have bought of their own volition and in many instances simply could not afford. But if you refused to do it, the government fined you, punished you. That represents a radical change in the nature and guiding philosophy of this country. This country was founded on the concept of individual freedom, not on Big Government coercing you to buy something that you don't want and you can't afford. But that is the theory behind ObamaCare.

In addition to that, for small business owners, it included a penalty for any business that exceeded more than 50 employees who did not provide government-approved health insurance policies. It cost them at least an additional \$70,000 a year, in addition to other increases in healthcare costs.

Let's say you are a small business of 50 or so employees. You are sure not going to hire over the cap and subject yourself to the additional \$70,000 a year in costs. What you are likely to do is to hire fewer than 50 employees in order to protect yourself from that expense, and that is exactly what happened.

I still remember, after the Affordable Care Act passed, having lunch in San Antonio, TX, with a friend of mine who was an architect at the particular time. When I described to him the nature of the employer mandate and its effect, he made it clear to me that he would rather lay off some of his employees in order to avoid that additional expense under the employer mandate. In fact, that is just what he did.

This is just another bit of evidence about the pernicious impact of the Affordable Care Act. It is not just about premiums. It is not just about deductibles. It is not just about freedom of choice. Literally, it has been a wet blanket on our economy.

This damage reaches across many different sorts of industries. According to a recent study by the Mercatus Center, an estimated 250,000 jobs nationwide were lost due to this mandate. That strikes me, frankly, as too small a number, but that is the number they projected. A quarter of a million people lost their jobs because of this mandate because small employers were moti-

vated to keep their numbers under the cap in order to avoid the extra expense. This does not even take into account the consideration of businesses that were forced to shut their doors altogether.

In other words, ObamaCare was, in part, premised on this idea that businesses could endlessly absorb additional taxes and new costs and mandates and somehow continue to keep their doors open and do business as usual, but that is not the real world.

It also does not take into consideration the many businesses that choose to cut the hours their employees can work instead of firing them. This is another one of those stealth characteristics of ObamaCare, in which employers are judged on the number of full-time employees they have.

I remember talking to a restaurant owner in East Texas—in Tyler, TX—who told me he had to lay off a single mother who was working as a waitress in his restaurant. He could not afford to have her work full time. He had to put her on part time in order to avoid the penalties that are associated with ObamaCare. What that meant for this single mom is that she essentially had to go out and get two jobs in order to fill the gap that was left by her going from full-time work to part-time work. That is not the only story I can tell you.

A small business owner in Donna, TX, epitomizes this reality in a letter that was written to me a few weeks ago. This gentleman said he and his wife are both on Medicare. Of course, they are unaffected directly by ObamaCare because Medicare covers people who are 65 years and older while ObamaCare covers people who are younger than that. While they were left unaffected personally by ObamaCare's changes, on behalf of his 54 employees, he wrote that after ObamaCare went into effect, he was faced with a choice, either he could buy his employees expensive health insurance that his business could not afford or he could pay fines totaling more than \$100,000. Instead, he made the painful choice to lay off six of his employees in order to remain under the ObamaCare-imposed threshold. As he pointed out, this meant more than just simply laying off six people; it also meant risking the well-being of each of those families represented by those six people.

Small business owners should not be forced to choose between growing their businesses and providing jobs or risking the financial livelihoods of their entire companies and their employees just to satisfy the demands of Big Government. Even beyond causing layoffs, ObamaCare has effectively ensured that many businesses cannot grow and that existing businesses will not hire any more employees.

ObamaCare did not just lead to a new form of healthcare coverage, as some have claimed, as two-thirds of the small businesses that were surveyed by

the Mercatus Center report already offered insurance. Two-thirds of the businesses affected by ObamaCare already had healthcare coverage, but that was effectively displaced and replaced by government-approved healthcare, which proved to be far more expensive.

Instead of having the choice to shop around for the insurance that best meets their needs and the needs of their employees, these businesses have been forced to either pay the penalty or to pay the piper—that is the Federal Government—when it comes to these mandates and these demands.

It ought to be clear by now—7 years into the implementation of ObamaCare—that this kind of one-size-fits-all mandate should not be applied to a country of 320 million people, especially when it comes to something as personal as healthcare. Each of us is a unique human being. Each of our families has its own unique needs and desires. Frankly, we ought to be able to choose the sort of healthcare coverage that best suits our needs as well as our incomes and our desires to buy health insurance. Some people want policies that provide purely for catastrophic coverage when they go to the hospital. Maybe they prefer to have savings accounts that use pretax dollars under health savings accounts in order to save money so as to pay for their doctors' visits, and they combine that with a high deductible health insurance plan. You literally cannot do that under ObamaCare, but you will be able to do that under the Better Care Act, which we will be voting on next week.

What we have tried to do is to look at the meltdown of ObamaCare and say that we need some emergency measures to take place because of the phenomenon I mentioned earlier in which insurance companies are pulling out, people's premiums are going through the roof, or deductibles are so high that they are effectively being denied the benefit of their health insurance. We need to do something quickly and urgently.

What we are going to do is take measures to stabilize the insurance markets because if insurance companies continue to pull out of the insurance markets and deny people a choice or competition or even access to a qualifying policy at all, that is going to put people in an impossible situation. So the first thing we are going to do is to stabilize the marketplace.

The second thing we are going to do is to repeal the mandates that have made health insurance so unaffordable and restore the freedom to choose the sorts of policies and create a marketplace in which people can choose the policies that best suit their needs and at prices they can afford. It will literally bring down the cost of what people are charged in order to buy healthcare coverage.

Because we understand the importance of protecting families against preexisting condition exclusions, we are going to make sure the current law

remains in effect that protects people from exclusions when they change jobs or lose jobs based upon preexisting conditions.

The fourth thing we are going to do in the Better Care Act is put Medicaid on a sustainable growth rate. Medicaid is an important program. It provides the healthcare safety net for the Nation, but unfortunately it is unsustainable at the current rate of spending. Over the next 10 years, we propose to spend \$71 billion more than we do today on Medicaid. In other words, it is going to continue to grow but at a more controlled and fiscally responsible rate.

We are also going to provide people with tax credits who have an income between zero and 350 percent, including those people who are left out in the event that the Medicaid expansion is not embraced by their States and States like Texas—people who are now at 100 percent of the Federal poverty level up to 138 percent who were left out because of the fact that Texas did not expand Medicaid to able-bodied adults. They are going to be able to use that tax credit to buy private insurance. Private insurance provides much better access to coverage because, right now, Medicaid pays doctors and hospitals about 50 cents on the dollar when it reimburses them. Private insurance pays them much better so it improves the range of choices available to consumers.

Our bill continues to be a work in progress. We have done our best to try to work with everybody who has been willing to work with us and to use their ideas. What we have tried to build is a consensus bill, but the fact is, our friends on the other side of the aisle have simply refused to participate in the process, thus leaving it up to us to save people and help people who are currently being hurt by the status quo. We are going to do our duty. We are going to fulfill our responsibility to our constituents the best we can under these circumstances. In recognizing that no bill is ever going to be perfect, certainly, we have to do what we can in order to help the people who are being hurt now under the status quo.

Let me just close by saying that I have heard my friend the Senator from New York—the Democratic leader—talk about this bill. If we are unsuccessful in getting this bill passed next week, he wants to engage in a bipartisan negotiation in order to address healthcare. Yet what I predict is this: What he is really talking about is a massive, multibillion-dollar bailout of insurance companies without there being any reform. To me, that is an exercise that, frankly, I am not willing to participate in. I will never support a multibillion-dollar bailout of insurance companies and not be able to reform the system that created the problem in the first place.

I urge all of our colleagues to work together with us. Bring us your best ideas. Work with us. Try to figure out

a way to be constructive in this process and help us to achieve a result. It is not going to be the final result. We will have other opportunities, for example, in the Children's Health Insurance Program, which is a bipartisan program that expires by the end of September. We will have another opportunity to come back—hopefully, then on a bipartisan basis—to do additional things that we were unable to do because of the constraints of the budget reconciliation process and the fact that our Democratic colleagues simply refuse to participate in saving the people who are being hurt today by ObamaCare.

I encourage my colleagues not to be lured by the seductive message of our friends across the aisle about doing something bipartisan after this bill is unsuccessful. They are not interested in changing anything about the structural defects in ObamaCare. If all we are going to do is propose to pay insurance companies billions of dollars more in order to bail them out—in order to support the same flawed structural program known as the Affordable Care Act—you can count me out.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time to share with my colleagues the experiences I had in the State of Maryland during our most recent work period and shortly before that, when I took the opportunity to meet with different groups with regard to the healthcare debate.

I had a townhall meeting this past week at Atrium Village, which is a senior living place in Baltimore County. We had a robust discussion primarily with seniors, but not just seniors, about their concerns as to whether the changes in the healthcare law would affect their ability in the Medicare system as well as relating to long-term care and Medicaid.

A little bit earlier than that, I had a townhall meeting at one of our local hospitals where we had a chance to talk with lots of people. It was an open townhall meeting, and a lot of people from the community showed up. They expressed their concerns about what would happen under the changes being suggested in healthcare on coverage and quality of coverage, and we had a very robust discussion.

I also had a chance to meet with leaders of the faith community as we talked about our responsibility to make sure healthcare is a right and not a privilege in the United States.

I met with the leaders of the community health centers in Park West, in Baltimore City, to talk about the impact on the viability of health centers if the Medicaid Programs were cut.

I had a chance to visit with Mosaic Behavioral Health Center, which deals with behavioral health in Baltimore, and their concern is, if we eliminate the essential health benefits of mental health and addiction, what impact that would have on access to care.

There was a consistent message from each of the places I met with, with regard to whether we would be able to maintain coverage—under the Affordable Care Act, we expanded coverage by tens of millions—and whether that coverage would be compromised under the legislation being considered in the Senate.

We also had a chance to talk about whether there would be a weakness in what benefits would be covered. I already mentioned mental health and addiction. There were also concerns expressed about reductions of benefits regarding obstetrics and how it would affect women, and pediatric dental care, which is a particular concern in Maryland after the tragic death of Deamonte Driver.

They also raised many issues concerning discrimination in healthcare that was present before the Affordable Care Act and whether these conditions would be returning. A young father told me a story about how his daughter was born prematurely and, as a result, the baby was in the neonatal intensive care unit for 4 months. When his daughter was 4 months old, she had reached her lifetime limit of what the insurer would pay for healthcare if we returned to lifetime limits. Whether we would be returning to the predatory-type practices of the insurance companies that were present before the Affordable Care Act and whether we would be returning to preexisting conditions or doing that indirectly through what benefits would be covered—that was expressed at several of my healthcare meetings.

I already mentioned the concerns that the elderly expressed, including the discrimination of the near elderly, if we go to a 5-to-1 ratio on health premiums, so that those who are 60 or 62 years of age paying five times higher premiums than younger people are paying. All of that was brought out during my townhall meetings.

The one message I just wanted to leave with my colleagues is that there was a strong interest that we work together—Democrats and Republicans—because we all acknowledge that the Affordable Care Act can be made better. We don't want to repeal it. We want to improve it.

Before we left for the July 4th break, I introduced legislation that deals with some of these issues. The legislation would improve competition by putting the so-called public option in the exchanges so that we know there would be at least one governmental option without subsidies, without any additional breaks over private insurance companies, to guarantee more competition in the marketplace.

I also included in my legislation a solution to deal with the two major problems that we have under the Affordable Care Act. For some people, the insurance premiums are too high. Why? Well, I asked CareFirst, which is the major health insurer in Maryland, about the uncertainty as to whether President Trump is going to fund the cost-sharing issues. My legislation makes it clear that those funds will be made available, as was anticipated under the Affordable Care Act.

I also provide predictable subsidies for lower income families, up to 400 percent of poverty, so that we can help bring down the cost of premiums in that marketplace, and we reimpose the reinsurance program so that we can spread the risk so the insurance companies know that they have a more predictable risk when they set their premiums.

All of this would make a big difference. CareFirst said that, in the individual marketplace in Maryland, if you do that and endorse the individual mandate, we could reduce our premium increases by 50 percent.

So I am trying to work, I hope with Democrats and Republicans, to deal with the problems that have been brought to our attention on higher premiums and then to deal with healthcare costs generally.

More and more people talk to me about bringing down the costs of prescription drugs. It is outrageous that Americans pay twice what our friends in Canada pay for the same medicines that are manufactured here in the United States. So why don't we have a more competitive marketplace? Why don't we have the rebates that we have in the Medicaid and the Medicare systems, and why don't we allow for more collective bargaining for prices in the pharmaceutical industry? My legislation would do that, and I know there is bipartisan support for that.

Lastly, we deal with more integrated care. I mentioned Mosaic, a behavioral health facility in Baltimore City. They have an integrated care model. If you come into their community health center, they will treat whatever your problems are. They are not going to say: Well, come in one day and we will deal with diabetes, and the next day we will deal with high blood pressure. Let's deal with the whole patient in a coordinated and integrated care model, and that would help save on costs.

My bottom line is this. No, I am not going to support weakening the Affordable Care Act. I am not going to support legislation that would diminish those who currently have coverage or the quality of their coverage. Let's work together—Democrats and Republicans—to deal with the real problems of bringing down costs in our healthcare system—everybody benefits from that—and to make sure there is more competition in our exchanges and to make sure there is better premium support for those who cannot afford their premiums. If we do that, then, I

really think we would be carrying out what the people of Maryland were asking me to do during the recess; that is, not to go back on the progress we have made under the Affordable Care Act. Let's build on that. Let's make healthcare more affordable, and let's deal with more competition on the premium costs.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

VENEZUELA

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I have, since the year 2014, come to the Senate floor on numerous occasions, perhaps more than I hoped to, to discuss the developing situation in the nation of Venezuela.

The reason why I have taken such an interest in this issue is because of the impact it has, first and foremost, on my home State of Florida. We are blessed in Florida, particularly in my hometown of Miami and in South Florida, to have a vibrant and diverse community with people from across the world and, particularly, from the Western Hemisphere. That, of course, includes a very substantial number of people from Venezuela, some who live in Florida for part of the year and some who have made it their permanent home. They have contributed greatly to our economy, to our culture, and to our lives.

It is through their eyes that I have witnessed the tragedy that has unfolded in that nation over the last 5 years. I use the word "tragedy," but I don't use it lightly. Venezuela is one of the richest countries in the world, blessed with natural resources that God has blessed that nation with and the largest crude oil reserves on the planet—certainly, more than the United States and Canada combined, as an example. They have highly educated and capable people and a long tradition of democracy. Venezuela has one of the oldest traditions of democracy in the Western Hemisphere. As much as anything else, not only is it a tragedy for the people of Venezuela—what has happened—but it is a tragedy for the hemisphere and, ultimately, for the world. We look at some of the great causes that the world is confronting and think what a democratic and prosperous Venezuela could be contributing, what its extraordinary people could be contributing. But the last 5 to 10 years—particularly the last 5—have largely been taken up by internal strife.

At the end of the day, my interest on the issue of Venezuela has never been the removal of anyone from power. It has been about the restoration of the democratic order so that the people of Venezuela can choose their path forward. We look at the history of our hemisphere, here in the Western Hemisphere, and we see that up until about 25 years ago, most of the nations in the Western Hemisphere were governed by dictators and strongmen on both the left and the right, and few, if any, people in our hemisphere had a role to

play in choosing their leaders. Today, but for the exception of a handful of places—predominantly, Cuba and the Caribbean and some others—almost all of the people of the region get to choose their leaders, and that has been the story of Venezuela up until very recently. Sometimes they choose leaders who agree with America, and sometimes they do not. But they choose their leaders.

In the end, we know that democracies very rarely start wars because their peoples do not tolerate it. Democracies always seek stability and prosperity because their peoples demand it, and they get rid of leaders who don't deliver.

So our goal from the beginning—my goal, in particular—has consistently been the restoration of the democratic order and, through that, the respect for basic rights and dignity of all people, particularly in Venezuela. It is sad to see what has happened because I think it is fair to say that the situation today in Venezuela is worse than it has been at any point since 2014.

We saw about a week ago the horrifying images of armed thugs storming the National Assembly—the democratically elected National Assembly—and attacking members of that assembly. It would be the equivalent of protestors storming the Capitol doors and attacking Senators and Congressmen. We saw images of uniformed personnel, some of whom, basically, are the equivalent of our Capitol Police, roughing up the very members of that assembly whom they are supposed to be protecting. We have seen the images of protests in the streets, of national guard troops firing on people with tear gas and rubber bullets and, in some instances, with guns.

We have seen these irregular groups called "colectivos" going after people in the streets. By the way, in fairness, we have seen violence on both sides of it, although the vast majority of people in the opposition—the enormous majority—seek a peaceful resolution to this. Anytime you put hundreds of thousands of people in the street, chaos happens.

You think not just of the protestors, but you think of their family members on the other side of it. We forget that these national guard troops, holding up their shields and wearing the uniforms, have sisters and brothers and husbands and wives and loved ones on the other side of that barricade, deeply dividing this proud nation with an incredible history of contributions that it has made.

The situation has now reached what I believe is the tipping point. Later this month, the Government of Venezuela—I should say the executive branch, under its current President—has scheduled an unconstitutional assembly. They call it a constituent assembly. It violates the very Constitution of the country, not to mention that the supreme court has already kind of canceled the democratic order and this adds to that. I just say this with deep

sadness. If that goes forward, I think it fundamentally changes the situation permanently.

I had an occasion early this morning to speak to the President on this topic for a few minutes, as I know he is headed overseas. He expressed his continued dissatisfaction with the course of events. I think it should be abundantly clear to everyone that this government in the United States is prepared to take additional significant measures if, in fact, that constituent assembly moves forward at the end of this month—basically, all but admitting to the world what we already know; that is, that the democratic order in Venezuela has ended.

I do believe that there is still a path forward—a path forward that doesn't involve vengeance, that involves reconciliation; a path forward designed to restore the democratic order. I believe deeply that all of my colleagues here in the Senate and in the Congress and the President of the United States are prepared to play whatever role they can to help facilitate that. I think that, obviously, ultimately, it would involve restoring democracy. It would involve respecting its own Constitution. It would involve holding free and fair elections, internationally supervised, not by the United States but by the United Nations or by neighboring countries. I just left a meeting a few minutes ago with the Foreign Minister of Mexico, a nation that has shown that it is willing to step forward and be constructive and productive in this endeavor.

That is the goal. The goal is to restore peace and order and to restore democracy and to grant amnesty and freedom to those who have been imprisoned because of their political views. Within that space, there are those within the government who themselves perhaps seek the same thing but feel trapped by the circumstances before the nation today.

So I do believe there is a path forward, but I also think it would be unfair if I didn't make clear that the time for that path is running out and the door will permanently close if, at the end of this month, the Maduro government moves forward with this assembly, which is illegal and unconstitutional. At that point, it would be clear for all that they have no interest and no intent of restoring democracy. I fear the consequences of that, not simply because of what the U.S. Government and the Trump administration might do but what it would mean to those in the streets who are already desperate as it is.

I do think that path is there. I do believe that opportunity is still available, but it will not be around forever. My hope is that cooler heads will prevail. My hope is that patriots in Venezuela—no matter what side of this debate they have been on up to this point—realize it is time to step up and further this process of reconciliation, not with a goal of vengeance or punishment but with a goal of freeing those

who have been imprisoned unjustly, with the goal of having free and democratic elections, with the goal of living up to constitutional principles, with the goal of restoring democracy to a great people and a great nation.

I know that I, for one, despite all of my criticisms and all of the speeches I have given and all of the measures we have taken, am prepared to do all I can to be helpful in that endeavor, to help the people of Venezuela take control of their destiny once again and restore the democratic order, the constitutional order in a way that unites the country, not one that further fragments and divides it.

I know the President has expressed a willingness to be involved in that process in whatever capacity is appropriate, knowing that other nations in the region are prepared to lead as well.

I thought it was important on this 11th day of July, as we get closer to that measure—which I think will do irreparable harm to this possibility—that I come here to the Senate floor and express this. In the end, I think all of us in this hemisphere and, ultimately, the world would benefit greatly from a Venezuela that fulfills its potential—the potential of its people, the potential of its economy, the potential of its proud history of democracy. Whatever we can do to be helpful in that endeavor, I know that this Nation is prepared to do in whatever capacity is appropriate in the eyes of the people of Venezuela.

Ultimately, the future of Venezuela belongs to the people of Venezuela, and that is what we stand for. We hope that we can be helpful in a process that brings them together—and not further divides them—and restores what they once had and deserve to have again: a proud democracy, a vibrant economy, and a people with extraordinary and unlimited potential to achieve great things on behalf of their nation, their countrymen, and the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

WELCOMING THE PAGES

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I want to welcome our new pages. They have been here all of 24 hours or so. I talked to some of them earlier today. They come from all over this country, and we welcome each of them.

I understand they are with us for 3 weeks, and we wish it could be longer. Who knows? Maybe it will be. We will see.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, I am here today to talk about healthcare. That is a subject we have talked a lot about, not just on this floor this week, this month, and this year but for years. A lot of times, when we talk about it, we seem to forget that this involves real people, people who live in our home States. They are moms and dads; they are parents. They are children. They are grandparents, aunts, and uncles. They are young, and they are old. They

are people from different walks of life. They are real people.

I want to talk today about one of them. Delaware is a little State. I like to kid my colleagues that a lot of days in the week I visit all the counties in Delaware. We have only three. Yesterday I got to go to all three of them.

In the southern part of our State is Sussex County, which is the third largest county in America. I think there are 3,000 counties in America. The third largest is Sussex County, DE. The county seat for Sussex County is called Georgetown.

Before I came over here yesterday afternoon to be here for the convening of the Senate, I stopped off and hosted a roundtable. There were about 20 patient advocates from organizations across the State of Delaware. We were in Georgetown at a place called the CHEER Community Center, which is a gathering place for seniors in the southern part of our State. A lot of good activities happen there for seniors from all over Southern Delaware.

Some of the organizations on the frontlines of our healthcare system were there. I am going to mention a couple of them. They include the Mental Health Association, the National Alliance on Mental Illness in Delaware, the Leukemia & Lymphoma Society, Autism Delaware, the American Heart Association, the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, the Alzheimer's Association, and atTAcK addiction. The folks at the roundtable explained to me and to others how the new plan that was presented several weeks ago would dramatically diminish their ability to care for the Delawareans they serve.

During our roundtable, we heard directly from representatives of these organizations, and we heard directly from patients. These Delawareans shared with us just how devastating a repeal of the Affordable Care Act would be for them and for their families.

One person's story stood out to me. She is a woman I have met before. Her name is Jan White. She is pictured here with her husband Mike. They live in Newark, which is at the other end of the State. If you drive up I-95 from Washington through Baltimore, on up to the Delaware line, the first town you come to in Delaware is Newark. That is where the University of Delaware is located. That is where they live.

Jan and her husband were college sweethearts. This October they are going to celebrate their 30th wedding anniversary. They run a successful small business in Delaware. It involves setting up meetings, running them, organizing and running special events.

Together they have one child, a son named Ethan. This September, Ethan will start his senior year at the University of Delaware, which is one of my alma maters. I went to graduate school there after the end of the Vietnam war on the GI bill. It is a wonderful school. He will be a senior there this fall.

Jan, depicted here with her husband, was doing everything she was supposed

to do to stay healthy. She ate right. She exercised. In fact, she was studying martial arts.

I eat right too. I exercise almost every day of my life and have since I headed to Pensacola, FL, as a newly minted ensign in the Navy. I still work out, just like Jan. One thing she has done that I haven't—she has studied martial arts and achieved her third-degree black belt. She did it a couple of years ago, in April of 2015.

Jan also worked hard at their business and helped to raise Ethan. Jan, Mike, and their son Ethan were living the American dream, but their lives were irreparably changed in April of 2016—a year after she earned her third-degree black belt.

Something happened. What happened was that Jan was diagnosed with aggressive stage IV non-Hodgkin lymphoma. It had invaded her chest and her spine. She went from teaching kickboxing and studying for her fourth-degree black belt to relying on a walker.

Jan underwent over 5 months of intense chemotherapy. I am told it was 102 continuous hours every 3 weeks. Think about that: 102 continuous hours of intense chemotherapy every 3 weeks. She had two injections into something called—I think it is a cavity in our brain—the Ommaya. She had two injections every 3 weeks for her spinal tumor, a high dosage of inpatient chemotherapy, and a month of radiation.

Jan was pronounced in remission earlier this year. Thank God. She desperately hopes to stay there, and our prayer is that she will.

When Jan was sick, she and her husband Mike kept working. There was no quit on that team. They kept working at their business, although it certainly wasn't possible to keep up with everything. That business had its usual pace that they followed.

As Jan has said, the bills don't stop just because you have cancer. That is true. Today she continues physical therapy repair damage from spinal cord compression from the tumor and the chemotherapy for the spinal tumor. She continues this therapy, even though her insurance-approved visits ran out a long time ago.

Jan monitors daily for relapse, hoping and praying it will not happen. She and Mike have worked hard to keep their business doors open and to try to put their lives back together.

The current debate in Washington over the Affordable Care Act makes Jan and Mike wonder if they will be able to afford the premiums that they face. Their current premiums now—including deductibles, out-of-pocket expenses, or denials—are double their mortgage payments.

Jan told me that they wonder if they will have to forgo Jan's medical care. They wonder if they will have to choose to pay for care and maybe put their family in bankruptcy. What if the treatments don't work?

Most of us know that cancer is a hard battle. In my own family, we know that my grandfather, his wife, and others who have fought cancer ultimately succumbed to it. It is a hard battle. Jan shouldn't have to fight for the chance to fight and survive. That is what she is doing.

We are encouraged that she has had better than a fighting chance. Jan and her family hope that those of us in this body—in the Senate—and our friends in the House of Representatives will do the right thing. That is why she is now involved with the Leukemia & Lymphoma Society as a patient advocate.

It is up to those of us in Washington to do the right thing by Jan—not only to do the right thing by her but by the 1.2 million people who have blood cancer, including roughly 400 Delawareans and the 50,000 cancer survivors who live in my State.

I will close by saying this: Last week we had the Fourth of July recess. The place was closed, and most of us were in our States. I covered the State of Delaware almost every day. I saw thousands—probably tens of thousands—of people during the course of that time. I am amazed at how many people talked to me about healthcare legislation. They called on us to do the right thing.

The other thing they called on us to do was to work together. Any number of people said to me: This shouldn't be all Republicans trying to solve this; this shouldn't be all Democrats trying to solve this. This should be everyone working together.

I couldn't agree more. I think we have a great opportunity right now to hit the pause button and not retreat to our different corners around here but to figure out how we can engage and do three things with respect to the Affordable Care Act: Figure out what in the Affordable Care Act needs to be fixed and let's fix it; figure out what in the Affordable Care Act needs to be preserved and let's preserve it; and if there are provisions in it that should be dropped, let's figure out how to drop them.

I talked with one of my colleagues, a former Navy guy from Arizona on the other side of the aisle. We came to Congress together in 1982. We served in the Navy together before that. We were talking yesterday about a path forward for us. We both said almost at the same time: What we should do is regular order.

I don't know if our new pages have heard that term, "regular order." What it means is pretty much this: If someone has a good idea—or maybe a not-so-good idea—on an important issue, introduce it as a bill. It gets assigned a committee, and the committee chair, ranking member, senior Republican, senior Democrat talk about scheduling a hearing. They hold a hearing—maybe not just one hearing but maybe a series of bipartisan hearings. Sometimes they actually schedule some roundtables in

addition to hearings, which are more of an informal discussion, which are sometimes helpful in working out consensus around the very difficult issues like healthcare.

The regular order is that after there has been a lot of testimony, a lot back-and-forth, a lot of questioning, they have a markup in the committee on jurisdiction. The markup is to vote on the bill before we vote on the bill. We have the opportunity for members—Democrats and Republicans have the opportunity to offer amendments to the legislation, amendments for and against, amendments that would change and hopefully improve the underlying bill.

After the amendments are offered, there would be a vote on the underlying bill, to keep it in committee or report it out. In regular order, if it is reported out, then it competes for time on the floor. That is something our leaders, Senator MCCONNELL and Senator SCHUMER, would need to work out amongst themselves.

If the bill makes its way to the floor, in regular order, we would have time for debate, especially for something this important. As I recall, when we debated the Affordable Care Act in committees, hearings, and roundtables, I think we spent 80 days. All told, I think over 300 amendments were offered. There were 160 Republican-sponsored amendments adopted to the Affordable Care Act. Is it perfect? No. Anything that big, that complex, should have been even more bipartisan than it was. This is something we need to get right.

I will close with this thought: If you go back 8 or 9 years ago, we had a new administration. I was a brandnew member of the Finance Committee, which has jurisdiction over Medicaid and Medicare. We share jurisdiction in the Senate on healthcare legislation; the other committee is the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, which is led by Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER of Tennessee and Senator PATTY MURRAY of Washington State, two very able people and leaders. I would suggest that they are the kind of leaders who can help us actually figure out what is the right thing to do.

I don't know that either party is smart enough to figure it out by themselves, but if you ask a lot of people around this country, including people like Jan and her family or folks who are providers, such as doctors, hospitals, and nurses, and folks who work in pharmaceuticals, health economists—if you ask a lot of people "What do you think?" there is a much better chance to ultimately get this right.

I will add a P.S. as a former Governor of Delaware, as some of my colleagues know. I call myself a recovering Governor. We have a new page here from Ohio. One of the guys from Ohio is now a pharmacist. John Kasich, my old colleague from the House, is now Governor of Ohio. He has been a strong voice in favor of just what I am talking

about doing, and that is to hit the pause button and figure out how we can do this together, and we need to.

In closing, I will paraphrase something Mark Twain used to say. Mark Twain used to say: "When it doubt, tell the truth. It will confound your enemies and astound your friends." Think about that.

In this case, maybe we should paraphrase Mark Twain: When in doubt, try regular order. When in doubt, try working together. When in doubt, try a bipartisan approach that is focused on getting this country and our healthcare delivery system a lot closer to where it needs to be.

Every President since Harry Truman said as President that we need to change our healthcare delivery system so that everybody in this country has access to healthcare. By the time we took up the Affordable Care Act in the Finance Committee and the Senate, we were spending, as a nation, 18 percent of the gross domestic product on healthcare in this country. I have a friend, and if you ask him how he is doing, he says: Compared to what? We are spending 18 percent GDP. What were they spending 8 years ago in Japan? They were spending 8 percent of GDP for healthcare in Japan. Did they get worse results? No. They got better results—higher rates of longevity, lower rates of infant mortality. In Japan they covered everybody. They still do. They are getting better results for less money.

Frankly, what we did in writing the Affordable Care Act was we looked around the world, including Japan, and we looked around this country, including at places like Mayo, the Cleveland Clinic, and others, to see what they are doing to get better results. We tried to put a lot of that in the legislation, in the law. Wonder of wonders, some is actually delivering good results—better value, better results for less money. That is part of the Affordable Care Act we want to maintain and preserve.

I have probably stood here long enough talking about this today. This is an important issue. It is one-sixth of our economy, and healthcare eventually affects us all. People who get sick will eventually get care. For too long, the care they have gotten has been in the emergency room of a hospital. By the time they get sick enough to go there, sometimes they are very sick. It is very expensive. They don't spend an hour or two in the emergency room of a hospital; they may spend a week or two in the hospital and really run up the tab. That is a hugely expensive way to provide healthcare. Who pays for it? The rest of us. We have to be smarter than that.

I am hoping that in the days ahead, particularly as our Governors gather up in Providence, RI, later this week to discuss, among other things, providing healthcare for their constituents in 50 different States, my hope is that some of what I said here today will be on their minds: Hit the pause button. Fix

the things in the Affordable Care Act that need to be fixed. Preserve the aspects that need to be preserved. Let's do it together.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I represented the congressional district of Springfield, IL, for 14 years, and this is my 21st year in the Senate. It is a big State with 102 counties. We are proud of our diversity in our State, which runs from the great city of Chicago, to deep, deep Southern Illinois, to a town of Cairo, IL, which is literally south of Richmond, VA, by latitude. They grow cotton down there in the State. So it is a very big and diverse State. I am proud to represent it.

I have spent some time doing my best to understand the challenges that businesses, individuals, and families face and to measure their sentiments on issues over the years.

For the last several months, I have spent my time visiting every corner of downstate Illinois, which is the more rural, smalltown area of our State outside of Chicago. It is more conservative politically. President Trump ran well in some parts of downstate Illinois. And I have been in this area—representing it, growing up in it—to measure what I consider to be the topic and issue of the day, and that is the issue of healthcare in America. It is an issue which each of us takes very seriously and personally because each of us is called on in a variety of different ways in our lives to have healthcare for ourselves and our family—the people we love—at critical moments.

We are now engaged in a national debate about the future of healthcare in America. The Republicans control the House, the Senate, and the White House, and have been from the beginning opposed to the Affordable Care Act, which was passed under President Obama. I voted for it. I think it was the right vote. I think it has achieved a great many things. I hope we can build on it to make an even better healthcare system for our Nation. It is not perfect. There are areas that need to be changed, improved, and areas that I think need to be strengthened over the long haul to make sure America has more fairness when it comes to healthcare for our people.

Last week, I visited about a half dozen healthcare facilities in Illinois. I jokingly said to my staff that I have come to know hospital administrators in my State far better today than I ever have.

Here is what they told me. They told me the healthcare bill that Senator MCCONNELL has proposed in the U.S.

Senate would be devastating to the families, the patients, the employees, and the healthcare facilities in our State. They told me that nearly \$800 billion in Medicaid cuts would cripple rural hospitals and health clinics. Not only would this harm patients in rural communities, but 35 percent cuts in the Medicaid Program would also cost jobs in Illinois. The Illinois Hospital Association in my State estimates that the Republican bill, which passed the House and now is being considered in the Senate, would cost us 60,000 healthcare jobs.

I went to Granite City, IL, which is near the St. Louis area. I met a young woman named Sam, who has Down syndrome and her mother Missy. They are worried about the Republican plan to cap Medicaid spending. Sam's health needs can't always be anticipated. There are not some that can be capped in terms of future needs, and the amount of care can hardly be determined in advance for this young woman who is doing her best to lead an active and involved life facing this disability, which she does. This is so true for so many people nationwide.

Some of my Republican colleagues in Illinois have said: We just don't understand why Medicaid as a program has grown so much. Well, it may be hard to understand until you look inside the program and realize what it does. Medicaid may have started as a small idea, but it has really grown into a major provider of healthcare in America. In my State of Illinois, it is responsible for paying for the prenatal care, birth, and care of mothers and their children after they have been born for more than 50 percent of the kids.

It is an important provider of healthcare resources to our school districts in Illinois, which count on Medicaid to help them take care of special needs students—counselors, psychologists, transportation, even feeding tubes for those who are severely disabled. It is a critical program as well for the disabled community, like Sam and young men and women who are victims of autism or Down syndrome who want to lead a full life but need health insurance. Medicaid is their health insurance.

One woman said to me in Champaign, IL, my 23-year-old son is autistic. He counts on Medicaid, and, Senator, if I don't have Medicaid, my only recourse is an institutional program that would cost us over \$300,000 a year. It is impossible for us to even consider that.

So those who would cut back on Medicaid spending in the name of flexibility and saving money or generating enough to pay for a tax cut for wealthy people would leave people just like those I have described in a terrible circumstance.

I haven't described the largest cost of Medicaid. The largest cost in Illinois and across our Nation is the Medicaid services and benefits provided to those who are older—mothers, grandmothers in nursing facilities and care facilities

who count on Medicaid along with Medicare and Social Security for the basics in life.

I heard from Kevin. He is a worker from Urbana, IL, who is worried that the Senate Republican bill is going to increase his out-of-pocket expenses by thousands of dollars. He is worried because he fits into an age category which would see premiums go up dramatically in costs under the Republican bill. The Affordable Care Act, which we passed under President Obama, set limits on the increases in premium costs so no premium paid would be more than three times the cost of the lowest premium that is paid for health insurance in our country. Well, Republicans have changed that. In both the House and Senate, they have raised that to five times. So it means for people, particularly between the ages of 50 and 64, they are going to see a substantial increase in their premiums because of that Republican provision. People are following this closely enough to know that when premium costs go up for many of them, it becomes impossible to buy the coverage they need.

As I returned to Washington, I once again face the reality of what this Republican healthcare plan would mean. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office told us the bill would cost 22 million Americans health insurance coverage—cutbacks in Medicaid as well as cutbacks in private insurance. Think of that. I don't know how the Republicans in our State can go home and explain why a million people in Illinois are about to lose their health insurance in the name of healthcare reform.

I can tell you the notion of repealing the Affordable Care Act may have had some surface political appeal until you realize you might be 1 of the 1 million people in my State who ends up with no health insurance when it is all over. It would cut Medicaid dramatically, as I have mentioned, and then keep cutting—a 35-percent cut over the next 20 years—with devastating impacts on hospitals, clinics, and many other facilities.

By 2020, average premiums in the individual market would increase by 76 percent under the Republican plan. Costs would skyrocket even higher for seniors, rural communities, and those with medical needs.

What happens to people with pre-existing conditions under the Republican repeal bill? One out of three Americans has a preexisting condition. In the old days, they couldn't buy insurance or, if they could, couldn't afford it because they had a history of cancer in their family, diabetes, heart disease. Well, this Republican plan would take away the protections of the Affordable Care Act. It would allow States to waive essential healthcare benefits, like maternity care, mental health treatment, substance abuse treatment. People in need of these services would be left to fend for themselves.

The Congressional Budget Office analyzed the Republican bill, and it said: "People who used services no longer included in the Essential Health Benefits would experience substantial increases in out-of-pocket spending on health care, or would choose to forgo the services. Moreover, the ACA's ban on annual and lifetime limits . . . would no longer apply."

With this scathing analysis from the Congressional Budget Office, what did the Republican leadership decide to do? Instead of addressing these challenges straight on, they retreated. They shut themselves off behind closed doors and tried to cut a deal within the 52 Republican Senate Members here to pass this measure, as bad as it is. There was not one hearing on this bill—on the Republican healthcare bill—no markups, no amendments, and no support from medical advocates in any part of our Nation. There was no input in the Senate from any Member outside the Republican caucus.

They want to call this bill right away, and it is understandable. The longer it sits out there and the longer people get to know it, the less they support it. You know we still haven't seen the final language. Why? Because Republicans continue to work in secret on a bill that literally impacts one-sixth of the American people and every single person in our country.

This measure affects everybody. Even if you get your insurance through your employer or Medicare, this bill would make Medicare go insolvent sooner and allow employers to, once again, impose annual or lifetime limits on care under their health insurance plans.

Now, the latest we have heard is that the Republicans are meeting in secret, making some changes to this bill. They may be throwing some money at the opioid crisis facing America, but that will not make up for kicking 15 million people off of Medicaid. The amount of money they are talking about to deal with the opioid crisis is literally inadequate to deal with the seriousness of that issue or to provide the substance abuse treatment people currently receive from Medicaid who will be cut off under the Republican plan.

Cutting Medicaid, our best tool to fight the opioid epidemic, and offering a coupon for drug treatment is a cruel step backward. If it ends up buying a vote on the Republican side, shame on my colleagues for selling out so cheaply.

Republican Gov. John Kasich of Ohio is not fooled. He called this idea of a special opioid fund to win some votes on the Republican side "like spitting in the ocean." I called Governor Kasich this last week. He and I came to Washington together many years ago. I have known him, and I like him. We disagree on some political issues, but he is very forthright and frank. He has warned us that what is going to happen to Ohio is going to happen to the Nation, if the Republicans have their way with their healthcare bill.

We have also heard the Republicans are considering adding provisions that allow insurers to offer bare-bones plans. I have just heard some more about this today, and I believe the author of this idea is the junior Senator from Texas, Mr. CRUZ.

Here is what he says: If your State offers a health insurance plan that complies with the requirements of the Affordable Care Act, then you may offer it to other consumers in the State insurance plans that do not. He says it gives consumers choice. Well, it sure does, but look at the choice it gives them because if he is aiming for lowering premium costs by offering health insurance plans that are junk plans, health insurance plans that are fake insurance, the net result is going to be people paying a lot more in copays and deductibles and a lot less coverage when they definitely need it.

There are a couple other things it will do. Because these younger healthier people will buy the cheaper plans believing they are invincible, it will end up raising the cost of premiums for those who buy other insurance. The discrimination, in terms of premium costs, will be dramatic, and that, in and of itself, could be damaging to people all across the United States.

So Senator CRUZ believes that offering junk insurance plans and telling the consumers we are giving you a choice is going to answer the needs across America. It will not. It will raise premiums on everyone else. It will provide inadequate coverage for those who buy these plans, and sadly many of them are going to be facing deductibles and copays they just can't handle. That is no answer. It may be a political answer to get his vote, but it is certainly not a credible answer.

We have had this before the Affordable Care Act, and do you remember what it was like? People got sick and found out their insurance didn't cover what they needed. Women who were pregnant found out their plans didn't cover maternity or newborn care. People who were diagnosed with a mental health condition found out their insurance covered no treatment for mental illness. So what good is insurance if it doesn't care for the most basic and essential needs of Americans?

Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, we changed it. We required that policies provide real insurance for real families. Do you know what happened, in addition to providing more care for people across America? The number of bankruptcies, personal bankruptcies, have been cut in half since the Affordable Care Act passed. Why? The No. 1 driver of personal bankruptcy and family bankruptcy in America was medical bills—medical bills that were beyond the payment of an ordinary person. There are fewer of those today because of the Affordable Care Act.

Senator CRUZ's plan for selling fake insurance or junk insurance plans that will not be there when you need them,

I can just tell you it means more business for the bankruptcy court. It would banish those with preexisting conditions to the world of sky-high premiums, all in the name of Senator CRUZ's freedom of choice. Well, freedom isn't free when it comes to relegating so many Americans to such a precarious state when it comes to health insurance. No matter how much the Republican Senators tinker around the edges, they are dealing with a flawed, unfixable bill.

The American people oppose any bill that rips health insurance away from millions of individuals and families, they oppose any bill that causes nearly 1 million people nationwide to lose their jobs, and they are also opposed to a Republican health insurance plan that would cost coverage for half a million American veterans.

The American people oppose any bill that hurts those with preexisting conditions. They oppose a bill that throws millions of people off Medicaid and slashes billions in Federal funding to hospitals, healthcare clinics, and schools.

The American people oppose any bill that is rejected by every major medical and patient group. The Republican bill is opposed by the American Hospital Association, the American Medical Association, nurses, pediatricians, AARP, heart, diabetes, and lung associations. How can you write a bill that draws that much opposition? They did it. They did it behind closed doors, and they don't want you to see what they are doing with it now.

Finally, the American people oppose any bill that takes away nearly a trillion dollars in healthcare in order to provide hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans and large corporations. Case in point: Of the 145 pages of the Senate repeal bill, 94 pages are devoted to slashing Medicaid and providing tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans and pharmaceutical companies.

Last week, one conservative writer penned an article which said that it gives conservatism a bad name when we are giving tax breaks to the wealthiest people in order to cut and eliminate health insurance for the poorest people in America. That is exactly what this bill does.

I am glad the Senate Republicans have delayed their vote on this repeal, but many have not given up. In all of my townhall discussions, the plea from Illinois people has been clear: Improve the Affordable Care Act; don't repeal it.

So where do we go from here?

First, Republicans need to take repeal off the table. We need 3 Republicans out of the 53 to say this is the wrong way to go about it.

Second, President Trump must stop undermining the stability of the marketplaces with his uncertainty and sabotage.

Third, we need to work together on a bipartisan basis to strengthen our cur-

rent system. We need to address the price of pharmaceutical drugs. The current bill and law does not. That is the biggest driver, according to Blue Cross in Illinois, of premium increases—the cost of pharmaceutical bills. We need to build competition through a Medicare-like public option available to everyone who chooses it across the United States.

Some Republicans, including Senator MCCONNELL, have said that the Republicans have to do this by themselves because the Democrats refuse to work with them. That is simply not true. We are here. We have been here all along, and we want to have a hearing. Bring in some experts. Let's just have a meeting. That would be a breakthrough.

Democrats have asked the Republicans to join us. Let's sit down together, informally, like grown-ups, and address this issue in a responsible fashion. We are ready and willing to work on legislation to improve the individual market for the 6 percent of the people who purchase their insurance there. I fail to see how gutting Medicaid and throwing 22 million Americans off of health insurance in order to provide tax breaks for rich people does anything to help that 6 percent.

This is a critical moment when it comes to healthcare across America. It is unfortunate that we are now considering a bill that was revealed only 2 weeks ago, a bill that has never been subject to a hearing before any committee, a bill that has never been amended in an open process.

When it came to the Affordable Care Act, over 140 Republican amendments were adopted. The Republicans haven't offered us an opportunity to offer one amendment to their proposal—not one. It is a take-it-or-leave-it, closed-door deal. That is not the way the Senate was designed to work. It is not the way the American people want us to work. They expect us to work in a constructive fashion on a bipartisan basis to solve the problems facing our Nation. The biggest single problem is giving peace of mind to Americans and American families across the Nation that they have healthcare they can count on and afford.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I have joined my colleague in coming to the floor to talk about how we need to make progress on healthcare and make sure that we don't pull healthcare out from millions of Americans. I thank the Senator from Illinois for talking about his constituents. Like the Senator from Illinois, I was at home this past July recess talking to my constituents, and I heard many of them talk about their individual healthcare needs and their concerns about what is happening in Washington.

I met a young woman who told me about her daughter who was born prematurely and weighed less than 2

pounds. Her daughter required specialized, expensive treatment as a newborn. She was concerned that if we keep moving ahead with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, she and her husband would be overwhelmed with crushing hospital debt if, in fact, we hadn't covered preexisting conditions. She is one of millions of Americans who are scared that they are going to lose their health insurance under the proposal that is being talked about, that has been talked about for the last several weeks, and from what we can tell—because, obviously, there is a lot of secrecy—may still include details about reducing coverage for those who have access to care through Medicaid.

I have come to the floor tonight to talk about the latest idea because I think one of the things that is clear—and probably why the Senate majority leader said that he wanted, basically, to cancel the first 2 weeks of the August recess—is that my colleagues don't want to go home and talk about the proposal that was brought before them. In fact, they are now trying to bring up a new proposal, thinking that, again, with a very limited time period, without floor discussion, without committee debate, without an amendment process, somehow our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will fall prey to the notion that there is a silver bullet, a magic solution. I have come to the floor knowing that an amendment or a discussion piece or the new behind-closed-doors discussion proposal being advanced by my colleagues from Texas and Utah is basically to allow junk insurance into the marketplace.

What do I mean by junk insurance? I mean a proposal that basically offers less than the essential benefits, such as hospitalization, prescription drug benefits, lab costs, and all of those things; that, basically, by offering a market where you can get junk insurance, you can say: Oh, well, you have to have one offering of insurance that does cover all the basics and essentials, but then you can have junk insurance.

I say "junk insurance" because this is the wrong idea for the marketplace. It is basically mixing good and bad and not having adequate risk spread across—so basically it means that you don't have to have compliant plans for the market. I know this firsthand because we had this in Washington. We had this same experiment in Washington in the 1990s, and people tried to do the exact same thing—basically, have a compliant plan, and then say that you have a bunch of less-than-adequate proposals for insurance in the market that really aren't giving individuals coverage. What happened? It drove up the cost of the compliant plans that covered most of healthcare and basically drove the insurers out of the market. That was the experience in Washington State. This same idea was tried, and it failed because basically it ran up the price, and insurers didn't stay around to offer options. They

couldn't make the mandate of the required plan work because it basically took the risk out of the system.

The notion that somehow this new idea by my colleagues is going to be the silver bullet is, in my opinion, not an answer at all. People who would be the ones who could get that kind of coverage for a short period of time would then end up leaving the rest of the people without adequate coverage. As I said, what happens is, the costs then just go up, and then the market has to adjust. I would say that in our State—because a lot of people are talking about leaving the individual markets over the proposals that we are talking about today because they are concerned about the costs and who is going to be covered—you would see a very rapid collapse of the individual market exacerbated by what my colleagues from Texas and Utah are proposing.

There are numerous nonpartisan health experts who seem to be saying the same thing. There is the American Academy of Actuaries, where one individual said:

People who are healthy now would tend to choose noncompliant plans with really basic benefits. People who want or need more comprehensive coverage could find it out of their reach, because it could become unaffordable.

Another individual from the American Enterprise Institute wrote that "the main effect of the Cruz-Lee amendment would be to shift costs from healthy consumers to less healthy consumers and households with lower incomes."

Douglas Holtz-Eakin, a Republican and former Director of the Congressional Budget Office called the amendment by my colleagues from Texas and Utah "a recipe for a meltdown."

Larry Levitt, senior vice president at the Kaiser Family Foundation, summed it up best when he called the amendment "a recipe for instability and discrimination."

So you can see that many people already understand the idea of junk insurance is not a market solution at all. It is not really even healthcare coverage. In its May 24 score of the House proposal, the CBO provided a definition of health insurance, saying that they would "broadly define health insurance coverage as consisting of a comprehensive major medical policy that, at a minimum, covers high-cost medical events and various services, including those provided by physicians and hospitals."

To me it seems pretty clear that the types of plans that could be sold under this proposal don't meet that definition.

What are essential benefits that we expect to be covered in a plan? Obviously, hospitalization, emergency services, ambulatory services, mental health, prescription drugs, rehabilitation, if needed, laboratory services, like lab tests, and we have moved toward some preventive, health, and wellness measures. Those are the es-

sential benefits that are supposed to be in a plan, and I want my colleagues to know that this experiment was tried. It failed. It drove insurers out of the marketplace because it just made the plans that were covering essential benefits so costly by distorting—really tearing the market apart.

The second point about the proposal we are hearing about is that it is still a war on Medicaid. In my opinion there are cost-effective ways for us to continue access to healthcare. I have brought them up on the Senate floor. One would be looking at rebalancing from nursing home care to community-based care or, as I have mentioned, a basic health plan that bundles up a population and serves them up to get a discount so that individuals would have as much clout as a large employer would have in the marketplace.

I hope that my colleagues will stop the focus on capping, cutting Medicare—because it would throw so many people off of the system—and focus on rebalancing people to the type of healthcare that will help us save costs, keep people in their homes, and give consumers the ability to compete cost effectively in the individual market.

These are the problems I still see with this proposal. To think, basically, that junk insurance will be the way for us to get a proposal and to see that Medicaid is still the target in a war on Medicaid, to me, is not the proposal to move forward on. I hope our colleagues will realize that both of these have severe faults and will sit down and talk about the proposals that will help us in establishing a more robust individual market.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

MR. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING R.J. CORMAN

MR. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to remember the life of my dear friend, R.J. Corman, and to congratulate a business he started in Kentucky on its 30th anniversary. A man from humble beginnings, Rick started a company at the age of 18 with only a backhoe and a dump truck. With a keen business sense and a tireless work ethic, Rick built his company and earned a reputation for doing work better and faster than anyone else in the business. Today the R.J. Corman Railroad Group employs over 1,600 people and operates in 24 States.

Rick's life was tragically cut short when he passed away in August 2013 at the age of 58 after a long fight with multiple myeloma, a blood cancer. Although his company had to learn how to succeed without him, the signature red locomotives and white cross-rail fences still carry Rick's name and his legacy.

Those who knew Rick could agree that he worked hard, cherished honesty, and had an infectious laugh. In 2011, Fortune magazine published a profile on Rick and his business. It read, "In the way he operates—and faces the world—Rick Corman is truly larger than life."

Rick started his company making track repairs for major railroads in 1973. With vision and determination, Rick convinced people to take a chance on him, and he began to expand his company.

This year, one of his businesses, the R.J. Corman Railroad Co., is celebrating its 30th year of operation. It opened in 1987, when Federal deregulation allowed railroads to sell unwanted lines of track. Rick, seeing both a profitable venture and a way to provide an economic boost to rural areas, began purchasing short line railroads. Today the business operates 11 railroad lines and more than 900 miles of track.

When Hurricane Katrina devastated the gulf coast in 2005, Rick's emergency response operation immediately offered to help. Rick personally oversaw the repairing of railways damaged by the storm. Despite the heavy damage, Rick answered the call to help those in need.

Rick's business acumen was impressive, but even more extraordinary was his unstoppable spirit. When he was diagnosed with cancer in 2001, he fought far beyond the doctors' expectations. Rick continued to work, to enjoy life, and even to finish the Boston Marathon. He deeply cared for his employees and his community. When one of his employees lost his home to a fire, Rick sent the family a temporary trailer the next day. Over the course of his life, Rick and his company made numerous contributions to St. Joseph Hospital in Jessamine County. The hospital remembered Rick as the largest philanthropic supporter in its history.

Rick's compassion and love of life inspired so many friends, family, and employees. He may be gone, but his legacy will remain, as we celebrate the 30th year of the R.J. Corman Railroad Co. Rick believed in his employees, and he said, "It's really the people that make this company so different. It's not me; it's the people." Today I ask my colleagues to help me remember Rick for his kindness, his courage, and his undefeated spirit.

The Lexington Herald-Leader recently published an article about Rick's life and legacy. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lexington Herald-Leader, June 16, 2017]

R.J. CORMAN WAS "LARGER THAN LIFE:" HE'S GONE, BUT HIS BUSINESS KEEPS GROWING
(By Tom Eblen)

One of the hardest things for a company to do is survive and grow after the death of a larger-than-life founder like Richard Jay Corman.

Carol Loomis, a legendary business journalist who interviewed America's most famous executives, wrote in a 2011 profile that Corman "just might be . . . the most unforgettable character I've ever met in my more than half-century at Fortune (magazine) . . . In the way he operates—and faces the world—Rick Gorman is truly larger than life."

Corman, 58, died in August 2013 after a dozen years of fighting multiple myeloma, a blood cancer. But R.J. Corman Railroad Group, the Nicholasville company he started in 1973 with a backhoe and a dump truck, doesn't seem to have missed a beat.

"Rick built a heck of a company and a nationally known and recognized organization," said Ed Quinn, who worked seven years for Corman and returned to the company last year as president and CEO after the retirement of Craig King, who led the company after Corman's death and remains on the board. "That's what we trade on every day and that's why we continue to grow."

The company, owned by a trust controlled by Corman's sister and three of his five children, has continued growing and acquiring businesses over the past four years. It also continues to be a major benefactor to Central Kentucky charities.

Probate documents filed in November 2013 valued R.J. Corman Railroad Group at \$226.7 million. Since then, employment has grown from 1,100 to more than 1,600. Although the company doesn't release financials, executives say annual revenues now exceed \$350 million.

This year, the group's R.J. Corman Railroad Co. is celebrating its 30th year. It began with the purchase of two Kentucky short line railroads in 1987 as federal deregulation allowed major railroads to sell off lines they no longer wanted.

Since Corman's death, the company has acquired short line railroads in Texas and South Carolina, bringing its operations to 11 railroad lines with 904 miles of track in nine states. The company owns more than 100 locomotives and 475 rail cars, and last year they hauled more than 65,000 car loads of cargo.

Those railroads include the 148-mile Central Kentucky Line that runs through Lexington, where Corman's signature red locomotives and white cross-rail fences have become a landmark at the corner of West Main Street and Oliver Lewis Way. The company's first short line, in Bardstown, includes My Old Kentucky Home Dinner Train.

Next year, R.J. Corman Railroad Group will mark the 45th anniversary of its railroad services business, which Corman began by repairing and refurbishing track for major railroads. Those operations are based at shops on the company's 1,600-acre main campus in Jessamine County and at field locations in 23 states.

The company's best-known operations are its derailment and disaster recovery units, which can dispatch teams around-the-clock to handle some of the industry's biggest breakdowns and cleanup jobs. R.J. Corman's most famous job was helping clean up Gulf Coast rail infrastructure after Hurricane Katrina in 2005. Last year, the company logged 4,560 emergency responses, including major floods in the Midwest.

The railroad group also has other businesses that serve both its short line oper-

ations and all seven of the nation's "Class 1" railroads. Those include track construction and maintenance, equipment maintenance, materials management, signaling design and construction, and railroad employee training. The company also offers railcar loading services for such major manufacturers as Toyota.

Railroads were the kings of American commerce from the Civil War until World War II, but declined after the Interstate highway system was built, leading to the rise of the long-haul trucking industry. But railroads have seen a resurgence as part of the world's multi-modal transportation network. Rail is still the most economical way to move many goods at least part of the distances they need to travel.

"While trucks and trains are competitive, there's also interconnection," said Noel Rush, the company's senior vice president for commercial development. "This is still a business you will see in 50 years."

And by reopening short lines that major railroads close, the company can provide an economic boost to small towns and rural areas with factories and warehouses that shut down when the railroad lines did, said Brian Miller, that division's president. He said the company is always looking for more short lines to buy.

"It has blossomed into a very good business for us," said April Colyer, Corman's daughter and the company's public relations director. "We're always trying to watch and adapt to the needs of customers in our industry."

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF WATT GLOBAL MEDIA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes to recognize WATT Global Media, a leading provider of business information and marketing solutions for the agribusiness industry worldwide, headquartered in Rockford, IL. More than 100 years ago, on July 6, 1917, WATT Global Media was born.

WATT Global Media's history began in 1917, when J.W. Watt and Adon Yoder purchased "Poultry Tribune," a magazine published monthly for just 50 cents for an annual subscription. Before Watt and Yoder bought the magazine, its circulation was about 5,000. In a few short years, these young entrepreneurs grew the magazine's circulation by 400 percent. Under Watt's leadership, "Poultry Tribune" quickly became "America's Leading Poultry Farm Magazine" for poultry raisers, peaking in 1940 with a circulation of more than half a million readers.

During the mid-1920s, economic changes in the poultry industry led to the creation of the commercial hatchery industry, which led the staff at "Poultry Tribune" to create "Hatchery Tribune." In 1934, Watt added "Turkey World" to its growing list of publications. WATT Global Media, originally called the Poultry Tribune Company, changed its name in 1944 to Watt Publishing Company. In that same year, the company acquired Better Farming Methods, "The business magazine for leaders who train and advise farmers." As the evolving poultry industry grew, so did Watt Publishing Company.

In 1949, Leslie Watt—the second generation of family leadership—was

named president of Watt Publishing Company and expanded the company into international markets, acquiring "Industria Avicola," a Spanish language magazine targeting the Latin American poultry industry. In 1962, "Poultry International" was created to cater to the poultry and egg industries throughout Europe, Middle East, Africa, and Asia. In the 1980s, Leslie Watt took Watt Publishing Company to China by establishing "Poultry International China Edition" and became one of the first publishers from North America to make Chinese language business-to-business magazines in the People's Republic of China.

In the 1990s, under James W. Watt—the third generation of family leadership—the company expanded its portfolio to include pet food. In 1993, the Petfood Forum was created and grew into the world's largest annual event of its kind. Overnight, Watt became the global pet food market leader for business information—what an accomplishment.

Greg Watt—the fourth generation President and CEO—modernized the company by taking it into the 21st century, expanding across multiple media channels, including online and digital platforms, live events, and magazine channels. In recognition of its global audience, the Watt Publishing Company changed its name to WATT Global Media in 2014. Today, WATT Global Media serves 180,000 professionals in the pet food, poultry, pig, and animal feed industries from over 140 countries.

I will close with this: In 1907, J.W. Watt came to this country from the Orkney Islands, just north of Scotland. He came in search of the American Dream, and boy, did he find it. Despite WATT Global Media's growth and many achievements, its proudest accomplishment is that it has been family-owned for 100 years, and this family business isn't going anywhere. I want to thank J.W. Watt, Leslie Watt, James W. Watt, and Greg Watt—four generations from the Watts family—for their service to Rockford, Illinois, America, and throughout the world. I know the good people at WATT Global Media will continue its simple guiding mission: "to improve the health and well-being of people and animals across the globe."

I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating WATT Global Media on 100 years of accomplishments, and I wish them all the best for another century of success.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to

the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-25, concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of the Netherlands for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$34 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

GREG KAUSNER
(For J.W. Rixey, Vice Admiral,
USN, Director).

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-25

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: The Government of the Netherlands.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$30 million.

Other \$4 million.

Total \$34 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Foreign Military Sales (FMS) case NE-B-WFV, implemented in June 2013, was below congressional notification threshold at \$26.3M (\$20M in MDE) and included one hundred and eighty (180) AGM-114R Hellfire II Missiles and twenty-four (24) M36E8 Captive Air Training Missiles (CATM). The Netherlands has requested the case be amended to include an additional seventy (70) AGM-114R Hellfire II missiles. This amendment will push the current case above the MDE notification threshold and thus requires notification of the entire case.

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Two hundred fifty (250) AGM-114R Hellfire II Missiles, Twenty-four (24) M36E8 Captive Air Training Missiles (CATM).

Non-MDE includes:

Hellfire missile cutaway model, AGM-114R missile spare parts, a Launcher Test Station (LTS), LTS spares, two (2) maintenance support devices, integrated logistics support tools, M299 launcher software upgrade and testing, aircrew familiarization training, launcher test station training, unclassified publications, technical assistance, AN/AWM-101A software, CATM spare parts and related support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Army.

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: NE-B-WFV.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: July 11, 2017.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Government of the Netherlands—AGM-114R Hellfire Missiles

The Government of the Netherlands has requested the possible sale of an additional seventy (70) AGM-114R Hellfire II missiles to a previously implemented case for Hellfire missiles. The original FMS case, valued at \$26.3M, included one hundred and eighty (180) AGM-114R Hellfire II Missiles and twenty-four (24) M36E8 Captive Air Training Missiles (CATM) with various support elements. Therefore, this case is for a total of two hundred fifty (250) AGM-114R Hellfire II Missiles, twenty-four (24) M36E8 CATMs, to include Hellfire missile cutaway model, AGM-114R missile spare parts, a Launcher Test Station (LTS), LTS spares, two (2) maintenance support devices, integrated logistics support tools, M299 launcher software upgrade and testing, aircrew familiarization training, launcher test station training, unclassified publications, technical assistance, AN/AWM-101A software, CATM spare parts and related support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total case value is \$34 million.

This proposed sale will enhance the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by helping to improve the security of the Netherlands which has been, and continues to be an important force for political stability and economic progress in Europe. It is vital to the U.S. national interests to assist the Netherlands to develop and maintain a strong and ready self-defense capability.

The proposed sale will improve the Netherlands' capability to meet current and future threats and will be employed on the Netherlands' AH-64D Apache helicopters. The Netherlands will use this capability to strengthen its homeland defense, deter regional threats, and provide direct support to coalition operations. The Netherlands will have no difficulty absorbing these missiles into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of these missiles will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Lockheed Martin. The purchaser typically requests offsets. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government personnel or contractor representatives to the Netherlands.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-25

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. AGM-114R: The AGM-114R is used against heavy and light armored targets, thin skinned vehicles, urban structures, bunkers, caves and personnel. The missile is Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU) based, with a variable delay fuse, improved safety and reliability. The highest level for release of the AGM-114R is SECRET. Software and firmware documentation (e.g., Data Processing, Software Requirements, Source Code, Algorithms) are not authorized for disclosure. The highest level of classified information that could be disclosed by a proposed sale or by testing of the end item is up to

and including SECRET. The highest level that must be disclosed for production, maintenance, or training is up to and including SECRET. Vulnerability data, countermeasures, vulnerability/susceptibility analyses, and threat definitions are classified SECRET or CONFIDENTIAL. Detailed information to include discussions, reports and studies of system capabilities, vulnerabilities and limitations that leads to conclusions on specific tactics or other counter-countermeasures (CCM) are not authorized for disclosure. Reverse engineering could reveal SECRET information.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapons systems effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

3. A determination has been made that the Government of the Netherlands can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sale is necessary to the furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the policy justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of the Netherlands.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, on June 29, 2017, the Agriculture Committee reported by voice vote the fourth authorization of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act, more commonly known as PRIA.

For nearly 20 years, PRIA has served as an example of bipartisanship, bringing together a wide range of stakeholders in support of a commonsense fee for service programs within the EPA's Office of Pesticides Programs.

PRIA provides certainty for registrants; much needed resources to the EPA to ensure regulatory examinations related to human health and environmental safety risks are done properly; and PRIA also provides vital funds for pesticide safety training and information to our Nation's farmworkers.

Unfortunately, after several years of carefully revising and finalizing an updated Worker Protection Standard, the EPA decided last month to delay key elements of worker protections, including the much needed revisions to the Certification of Pesticide Applicators rule.

Without strong and timely farmworker protections, PRIA simply does not make sense for some stakeholders who are a part of the coalition. The funds from PRIA allocated to farmworker protection should be meaningful resources that complement strong, effective protections and should not be undermined by changes to EPA's Worker Protection Standard and the Certification of Pesticide Applicators rule that would weaken farmworker protections.

Therefore, I strongly oppose any future efforts by the EPA to delay or amend the worker protection rules that the Agency finalized in November 2015 and January 2017, respectively,

without undertaking a negotiated rule-making, which must include all relevant stakeholders, to ensure that all voices are heard.

I hope the EPA will take a cue from our recent bipartisan and consensus-based committee action on PRIA and proceed in a similar fashion should they decide that any delays or adjustments to the Worker Protection Standards or the Certification of Pesticide Applicators rule are necessary.

Should the Trump EPA dismiss the concerns of farmworkers and environmental advocates, I fear that last month's committee vote may unfortunately be the last bipartisan PRIA reauthorization that this panel is able to report out. I hope that is not the case, and I know other members of the committee share my concerns on the matter.

Once again, I want to thank Senator ROBERTS for his leadership. I am glad we were able to move forward in a bipartisan and consensus manner to reauthorize PRIA last month.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, the ranking member of the Senate Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee, for engaging in this important discussion.

I am proud to stand before my colleagues in the U.S. Senate to discuss some of the bipartisan work that we have accomplished through regular order at the Agriculture Committee specifically with regard to H.R. 1029, the Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2017, or PRIA 4.

PRIA, while technical in nature, is critically important with assisting both EPA in carrying out administrative functions and industry that relies upon timely, science-based pesticide registration decisions to get products on the market and in the hands of farmers, ranchers, and other consumers.

PRIA, historically, has received widespread support from a diverse coalition of stakeholders, including members of the pesticide registrant community—both agricultural and non-agricultural uses, labor, and environmental advocates, which has contributed to Congress's ability to pass reauthorizations swiftly and by unanimous consent. With the Widespread support of the PRIA coalition, as illustrated by a coalition letter addressed to our committee on June 29, 2017, which expresses support of the amendment to H.R. 1029 and urges swift action, this effort should be no different.

Our committee held a hearing earlier this year to review this issue in an open and transparent manner. As we have heard time and time again, farmers and ranchers want regulatory certainty. EPA and registrants who rely on PRIA to get new products on the market and in the hands of farmers, ranchers, and other consumers want certainty.

My colleague raises an issue that has historically been outside the scope of the technical, fee-based registration

process of PRIA. I certainly understand the concerns that have been raised by some groups with regard to certain actions EPA is considering with regard to the Worker Protection Standard and the Certification of Pesticide Applicators rules. My hope is that EPA and the relevant stakeholders can constructively discuss areas of concern related to these issues within the framework of our Federal regulatory process without jeopardizing PRIA.

Current authority for PRIA expires at the end of this fiscal year. With that deadline in mind, our recent committee action is timely and necessary to get PRIA updated.

Should PRIA's authority lapse, pesticide registration will not be available for a wide range of crops that rely on innovative and new solutions for pest protection, and a lapse will have a negative impact on the products requiring registration that are used to protect public health and ensure public safety.

It is important that we get PRIA across the finish line not only to provide certainty to the industry but to also provide new products to growers for crop protection and to consumers to protect public health, and the timely reauthorization provides resources to ensure safety education components are maintained.

I thank my colleague Senator STABENOW and other members of the Agriculture Committee for working with me on this issue together and in a bipartisan manner. I look forward to working with Senator STABENOW and the coalition in support of this legislation to get this bill across the Senate floor as quickly as possible and ultimately enacted into law.

TRIBUTE TO ROSEMARY E. RODRIGUEZ

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I wish to recognize a dedicated community leader, civil servant, and dear friend, Rosemary E. Rodriguez. She most recently served as my State director and senior adviser. Throughout her life, Rosemary has displayed a genuine and consistent commitment to strengthening our State and our country.

Rosemary began her career as a legal assistant at two of Denver's most prominent law firms. Also, during the early stages of her career, Rosemary began her lifelong commitment to the Latino community as she helped form the Hispanic League, an organization that strives to be a liaison between the non-Hispanic and Hispanic communities. Rosemary began her career in government in 1992, working for Mayor Wellington Webb's administration. She served in several roles during her time with the mayor, such as deputy director of the mayor's Office of Arts, Culture & Film, Denver County clerk and recorder, and director of boards and commissions.

In 2003, she was elected to the Denver City Council. Later, her peers on the council elected her as president. In

2007, she began to work on the Election Assistance Commission. In this capacity, she worked to preserve the integrity of our national elections and increase access to our most fundamental right to vote. She chaired the commission in 2008.

In 2009, Rosemary became an invaluable part of my staff as State director and did a tremendous job representing our office and connecting with communities across Colorado. When I wasn't able to attend an event, I was always confident that Rosemary would convey our team's values and perspectives on any number of issues. I also counted on her advice whether it related to women's issues, immigration reform, or other issues of importance to the Latino community. Most recently, she was elected to the Denver School Board where she continues to serve Colorado's kids.

Due to her dedication to the people of Colorado, Rosemary has received several awards including the Mi Casa Resource Center's Volunteerism Award, the Anti-Defamation League's Passing the Torch Award, and the Denver Public Library's Cesar Chavez Hall of Fame Award.

I have been honored to work with my friend Rosemary for the past 8 years. Her intellect, creativity, and compassion should serve as an example for all those who serve. I wish her the best in her future endeavors, and I fully intend to count on her advice and perspectives for years to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING TED SHANNON

• Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life and legacy of Ted Shannon, whose passing marks the end of an extraordinary life spent in service to country, community, and family. Ted committed his life to the pursuit of justice and equality. Ted and his late wife Dorothy were incredible pillars who had a great influence on me as I entered a life of public service.

Ted Shannon showed up. In service to his country, he became a civil affairs officer in July of 1941 during WW II, attached to the British 8th Army during the occupation of Italy. In his subsequent post, he served as executive officer for the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force in Paris.

He showed up as a leader in education, whether it was in his role as a Ford Foundation higher education adviser for five Middle Eastern countries in Lebanon—the nation of his ancestors—or as a highly regarded UW-Extension faculty member and dean for more than three decades.

Ted Shannon showed up. Along with Dorothy and fellow travelers from the New Deal era, Ted supported progressive causes at all levels of government for more than half a century. I cannot recall an event, large or small, for a progressive organization where I did

not see Ted and Dorothy pitching in, providing leadership and encouragement no matter how challenging the cause.

He showed up as a beloved husband, father, grandfather, and friend. Ted met and married the former Dorothy Judge while at Yale pursuing his Ph.D. on the GI bill and shared his life with her until her passing in 2003. Ted was father to Tad, Sara, and Pam. Ted showed up as a hunting and fishing companion to son, Tad, and sage adviser on matters of food, music, languages, and world travel to Sara and Pam. He enjoyed outdoor adventures with his dear friend, Bill Threinen. Ted, Dorothy, Bill and Connie Threinen were friends and compatriots in advancing beloved ideals and forward-thinking causes for decades. A few years after Dorothy's passing, Ted married second wife, Kate Foster, of Eau Claire and continued his life of service for another 9 years.

Ted showed up. He was a doer. He walked the talk. Ted's multifaceted legacy is perhaps best illustrated by the words of Cuban poet Jose Marti: "Men of Action, above all those whose actions are guided by love, live forever."

The life of Ted Shannon serves as inspiration for anyone who seeks to create a world of peace, dignity, and opportunity for all. I miss him dearly.●

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF OSHKOSH CORPORATION

● Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the 100th anniversary of a great Wisconsin company: Oshkosh Corporation.

Oshkosh Corporation began ten decades ago when cofounders William Besserdich and Bernard Mosling believed they had created something that would change transportation in America. Their new technology would improve vehicle steering and drive capacity, two factors that were essential for navigating unfinished roads. While the engineering was groundbreaking, they could not find a manufacturer who would purchase and build their designs.

Faced with possible failure, William and Bernard moved on to plan B: manufacturing and launching their own vehicle. On May 1, 1917, they founded the Wisconsin Duplex Auto Company that soon issued its four-wheel drive truck prototype, known as Old Betsy, using the duo's innovative technology. The company's rapid growth led them to move the production facility from Clintonville to Oshkosh, where it was renamed the Oshkosh Motor Truck Manufacturing Company.

Over the next 3 years, the Oshkosh Motor Truck Manufacturing Company grew exponentially as a defense supplier for the U.S. military. In 1945, the U.S. Army and U.S. Navy presented Oshkosh with the "E" award for excellence in wartime production. Throughout the 1940s, companies like Auto Body Works, Inc., and Kewaunee Ship-

building and Engineering, which would later become part of the larger Oshkosh Corporation, made their marks on the military industry. The success of these companies built the foundation for Oshkosh Corporation's current success.

The escalation of the Cold War led to Oshkosh's first major defense contract. They produced 1,000 WT-2206 snow removal vehicles that allowed the Air Force to remove snow for bomber planes. Throughout the 1950s, the company continued to produce high-quality, technologically advanced trucks for various branches of the military. As our country transitioned out of a wartime economy, the company's focus shifted, resulting in the 1967 name change from Oshkosh Motor Truck Company to Oshkosh Truck Corporation.

Over the next several decades, Oshkosh continued to grow, as did its subsidiaries. Whether it was defense or construction, Oshkosh is known for its consistency, advanced technology, and efficient designs. In the area of defense, the Oshkosh name has become synonymous in the minds of U.S. servicemembers with quality, durability, and safety. From heavy-duty trucks, to the lifesaving MRAP—which was rapidly produced by skilled and patriotic Wisconsin workers in order to accelerate the safer vehicle's deployment to Iraq and Afghanistan—to the current production of the joint light tactical vehicle, Oshkosh boasts an unparalleled track record of delivering leading capability to our men and women in uniform. That is a record I have been honored to support throughout my time in Congress. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I have worked to secure the funding required by the Armed Services to meet their need for tactical vehicles.

I have also been proud to represent Oshkosh in the Senate because the company has a steadfast commitment to its employees. Whether it was 1917 with two employees, 1972 with 500 employees, or present day with over 12,000 employees across the world, Oshkosh provides for its employees with scholarships, employee safety, and support. On the production floor or in the office, Oshkosh Corporation employees' remarkable dedication can be seen throughout the organization. I have been honored to meet many of these talented workers, including speaking with hundreds at a recent all-hands call at the Oshkosh Defense facility in Wisconsin.

Oshkosh's success has also lifted the fortunes of hundreds of Wisconsin companies throughout its various supply chains. Oshkosh is a true linchpin of my home State's manufacturing economy, and both its commercial and government programs support thousands of good-paying, skilled jobs. Just last year, I had the opportunity to partner with Oshkosh Defense and the Wisconsin Procurement Institute to

strengthen this vibrant network by convening an event to build relationships between Wisconsin suppliers and Federal agencies.

I would also like to commend the company's current leadership, including president and CEO Wilson Jones, and John Bryant, the president of Oshkosh's defense unit, both of whom I have had the pleasure of working with over the years. Similarly, I want to recognize the tremendous contributions made by their immediate predecessors, Charles Szews and John Urias, respectively. The steady hand provided by these leaders will ensure that the company is an integral part of Wisconsin's economy for another 100 years.

Now, 100 years after the creation of "Old Betsy," Oshkosh Corporation and its brands continue to lead the industry; yet the company has remained firmly committed to its strong ethics and employee-centric culture. For the last ten decades, Oshkosh Corporation has cemented its international reputation for innovation and excellence. I know Oshkosh leadership and frontline employees will continue to hold themselves to this high standard, as they continue to grow and contribute to our great Wisconsin economy. I am so pleased to add my voice in celebrating this monumental anniversary.●

RECOGNIZING CAMP BEAUREGARD

● Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, today I would like to acknowledge and honor Camp Beauregard on its 100th year of service. Named after famed Louisiana General Pierre Gustav Toutant Beauregard, Camp Beauregard is a U.S. Army installation operated by the Louisiana National Guard. For the past century, Camp Beauregard has hosted hundreds of thousands of soldiers training for combat missions all across the world and has served the State and local communities.

The site that eventually became Camp Beauregard was constructed in the late 1850s as a military academy. Following the Civil War, the school was relocated to Baton Rouge and renamed Louisiana State University. In the early 1900s, the site became the permanent camp for the Louisiana State National Guard's annual training exercises. The site officially became Camp Beauregard in 1917 as the United States entered World War I. Over 44,000 soldiers trained at Camp Beauregard before the end of the First World War, and hundreds of thousands of men trained at Camp Beauregard during the Second World War.

Camp Beauregard is currently the largest National Guard post in Louisiana and is essential to the Louisiana National Guard's efforts to serve the United States, Louisiana, and local communities. Not only does Camp Beauregard serve as a training ground for soldiers preparing for overseas combat operations, the camp also plays a vital role during major weather events and hosts competitions and family

events. For 100 years, Camp Beaugard has served Louisianans and Americans alike.

I and my fellow Louisianans are proud of Camp Beaugard's accomplishments and the positive impact the training there has had on our State, our Nation, and across the world. I would like to thank those currently at Camp Beaugard as well as all those who have served our country there, and congratulate them for 100 years of service and patriotism.●

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL JAMES F. MARTIN, JR.

● Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, Maj. Gen. James F. Martin, Jr., USAF, will officially retire from Active Duty at the end of September. This month, Major General Martin's friends are gathering at the Pentagon to celebrate his career. In advance of that event, I wanted to say a few words about this exemplary military officer and adopted Alaskan who has devoted his entire 32 year career to the security of our Nation.

Major General Martin was born and raised in the State of Missouri. He completed his undergraduate work at Mississippi State University in accountability and was commissioned as an Air Force officer through the ROTC Program. His initial assignment was Lowry Air Force Base, CO. Major General Martin pursued a traditional Air Force career serving in Texas, Panama, Italy, Hawaii, Ohio, and multiple stints in the Nation's Capital. In 1992, he was the Air Force Finance and Accounting Officer of the Year and has received numerous other awards and distinctions throughout his career.

Although Major General Martin served throughout the Air Force, it was a fine day in 2001 when he arrived at Pacific Air Forces, PACAF, to serve as chief of the Operations and Maintenance Budget Branch. In 2006, Major General Martin, then Colonel Martin, took his first assignment in Alaska as commander of the 354th Mission Support Group, Eielson AFB. Major General Martin learned the hard way that, once bitten with the wonders of Alaska, you can never let it go. During that Alaska assignment, Major General Martin made friends around the State. Following his Eielson assignment, Major General Martin returned to PACAF Headquarters, first as director of financial management and comptroller and subsequently as chief of staff. He then began the first of three stints working for the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Financial Management and Comptroller.

In July 2013, Major General Martin was named Deputy Assistant Secretary for Budget, his capstone experience and the role from which he will soon retire. As Deputy Assistant Secretary for Budget, Major General Martin is responsible for planning and directing the formulation of the Air Force budget. This is a weighty and stressful re-

sponsibility in any year, but Major General Martin arrived his position just in time to deal with the 2013 government shutdown, as well as the overhanging threat of sequestration which continued to dog him for the remaining days of his Air Force career.

In spite of the many difficult challenges that faced his office, Major General Martin maintained the bearing of a calm and happy warrior; completely devoted to the cause of our airmen, airpower, and air dominance. The Deputy Assistant Secretary for Budget is responsible for the Air Force's relationship with members of the Defense and Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittees. Under his leadership, the appropriations liaison team was uniformly responsive and helpful to me and my staff. Major General Martin played a significant role in restoring congressional confidence in the Air Force as it emerged from several very difficult years in its relationships with Capitol Hill.

The Air Force's loss is Alaska's gain. Retirement will free up Major General Martin to spend more time in his beloved Alaska, and I understand that he plans to spend more than a few days in Unalaska—Dutch Harbor, one of his favorite places. I hope to continue to rely upon General Martin in retirement for advice as I have many retired general officers whom I have come to know through their service in the State.

In Alaska, we take great pride that the path to a great Air Force career seems to run through our State. We have had more than our share of servicemembers who leveraged their time in Alaska to reach the highest levels of their profession. Major General Martin is among this select group, and his exemplary career sets an example for Alaska's airmen about where you might end up if you simply "Aim High."

On behalf of my Senate colleagues, I take this opportunity to thank Major General Martin for his service and wish him well in retirement.●

REMEMBERING MICHAEL GORDON

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to the memory of a man who was a great friend of mine: Dr. Michael Gordon.

A professor at the University of Miami, Michael's love for medicine and people impacted the lives of so many, both inside the classroom and out. Michael first came to Florida in 1960 and eventually returned in 1966 to teach at the Miller School of Medicine at the University of Miami, a move that would keep him in the Sunshine State for the rest of his life. His tenacity intelligence led to critical medical breakthroughs, but it didn't come easily.

Michael's first invention, "Harvey"—the cardiopulmonary patient simulator used across the globe—was initially viewed with contempt and suspicion amongst his contemporaries. But that

did not discourage Michael. And thank God for that, because the once-ridiculed invention has since been used by many in the field of cardiology around the world. His relentlessness and ambition served as a testament to his character. He was a man with unfailing dedication to the well-being of others.

He also created UMedic, a system fostering research and learning in cardiology. Michael also devised training for first responders, which undoubtedly saved many lives over the years. He founded the Medical Training and Simulation Laboratory, which was eventually named the Michael S. Gordon Center for Research in Medical Education. The center focused on the mission of improving medical techniques and training paramedics and firefighters.

So many of us in the Miami-Dade community cherish his memory. While some in our community may never know his name, their loved ones may very well be saved by one of his innovations or the training he provided to first responders. Over the course of his life, Michael would bear many titles, including professor, mentor, innovator, doctor, inventor, friend, father, grandfather, and husband. To put it simply and quite literally; his friendship and passion touched many.

I am proud to have known such a tremendous human being and benefactor to the Miami community. My wife Jeanette and I will forever miss him and we join our friends at the University of Miami and his family in honoring his legacy.

May God bless him, his family, and those who continue his mission of saving lives and advancing medicine.●

RECOGNIZING THE ALCHEMIST BREWERY

● Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, my staff recently had the pleasure of visiting with Jen Kimmich of The Alchemist Brewery in Stowe, VT.

The Alchemist owners Jen and John Kimmich are model employers who have shown considerable dedication toward creating positive working conditions for their employees. Their workers receive excellent benefits and working conditions, including livable wages, paid sick days, vacation time, health insurance, wellness opportunities, paid family leave, and generous retirement benefits. The Alchemist not only produces an internationally award-winning product, but it has also fostered a workplace culture where people are put before profits.

Further, I would like to thank Jen for her statewide leadership championing workers' rights. She serves on the State Workforce Development Board helping to create opportunities for good jobs in Vermont. Through her volunteer work with Main Street Alliance, Jen has advocated for paid sick leave and paid family leave legislation.

I also commend the company for developing The Alchemist Foundation.

The Foundation provides college scholarships and career pathway opportunities for area youth.

I am grateful for all that they do for their employees, their community, and the entire State of Vermont. Companies across the Nation should follow in The Alchemist's footsteps by supporting workers' rights and creating a positive workplace.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE ISSUANCE OF AN EXECUTIVE ORDER THAT AMENDS EXECUTIVE ORDER 13761 OF JANUARY 13, 2017—PM 12

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with subsection 401(b) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(b), and subsection 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(b), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the "order") that amends Executive Order 13761 of January 13, 2017, by changing certain effective dates and revokes a reporting requirement in that order.

The order changes the date by which the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, is to provide a report to the President on the Government of Sudan's progress in sustaining the positive actions taken by the Government of Sudan that gave rise to Executive Order 13761, from July 12, 2017, to October 12, 2017. The order also changes from July 12, 2017, to October 12, 2017, the effective date for the revocation of sections 1 and 2 of Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, and the entirety of Executive Order 13412 of October 13, 2006, provided that the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Administrator of

the U.S. Agency for International Development, publishes on or before October 12, 2017, a notice in the *Federal Register* stating that the Government of Sudan has sustained the positive actions that gave rise to the order and has provided to the President the report described above.

The order revokes the requirement in Executive Order 13761 to provide an updated version of the report annually thereafter and, concurrent with those reports, to publish in the *Federal Register* a notice stating whether the Government of Sudan has sustained the positive actions that gave rise to Executive Order 13761.

The President issued Executive Orders 13067 and 13412, among other orders, to deal with the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the actions and policies of the Government of Sudan, including support for international terrorism; efforts to destabilize neighboring governments; and the prevalence of human rights violations.

In Executive Order 13761, the President determined that the situation that gave rise to the actions taken in Executive Order 13067 and Executive Order 13412 related to the policies and actions of the Government of Sudan had been altered by Sudan's positive actions over the prior 6 months. Executive Order 13761 directed the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, and based on a consideration of relevant and credible information from available sources, including nongovernmental organizations, on or before July 12, 2017, to provide a report to the President on the Government of Sudan's progress in sustaining its positive actions that gave rise to Executive Order 13761. Executive Order 13761 further provided that if the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, published on or before July 12, 2017, a notice in the *Federal Register* stating that the Government of Sudan had sustained the positive actions that gave rise to Executive Order 13761 and had provided to the President the report described above, the revocation of sections 1 and 2 of Executive Order 13067 and the revocation of Executive Order 13412 would become effective.

While the Government of Sudan has made some progress in areas identified in Executive Order 13761, I have decided that more time is needed for this review to establish that the Government of Sudan has demonstrated sufficient positive action across all of those areas.

For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to amend the effective date to October 12, 2017, to provide the report required by Executive Order

13761 and revoke sections 1 and 2 of Executive Order 13067 and Executive Order 13412, provided that further action is taken by the Secretary of State, as set forth in Executive Order 13761, and to revoke the subsequent annual reporting requirement in Executive Order 13761.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

DONALD J. TRUMP,
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 11, 2017.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:17 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 955(b)), the Minority Leader reappoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the National Council on the Arts: Ms. Chellie Pingree of Maine.

The message further announced that pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 2081, the Minority Leader reappoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the United States Capitol Preservation Commission: Ms. Marcy Kaptur of Ohio.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 431(a)(3) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-31), the Minority Leader appoints the following individuals to serve as Commissioners to the Women's Suffrage Centennial Commission: Ms. Nicola Miner of San Francisco, California and Ms. Jennifer Siebel Newsom of San Francisco, California.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 4 of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-196), the Minority Leader appoints the following members to serve as Commissioners to the United States Semiquincentennial Commission, from private life: Mr. Grant Hill of Orlando, Florida, Ms. Amy Gutmann of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and Mr. Noah Griffin of San Francisco, California.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2040. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Livestock, Poultry, and Seed Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Beef Promotion and Research; Reapportionment" (Docket No. AMS-LPS-16-0071) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2041. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Importation of Fresh Pitahaya Fruit From Ecuador

into the Continental United States” (RIN0579-AE12) (Docket No. APHS-2014-0095) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2042. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report of nine (9) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2043. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michelle D. Johnson, United States Air Force, and her advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2044. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Joseph W. Rixey, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2045. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Thomas J. Trask, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2046. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report of two (2) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half), in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2047. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Commission Delegated Authority Provisions and Technical Amendments” (RIN3038-AE42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2048. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations that was declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2049. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Russian Sanctions: Addition of Certain Entities to the Entity List” (RIN0694-AH39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2050. A communication from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Bureau for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2051. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, Amtrak, transmitting, pursuant to law, Amtrak’s fiscal year 2018 General and Legislative Annual Report; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2052. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “National Emission Standards for Haz-

ardous Air Pollutants From the Portland Cement Manufacturing Industry: Alternative Monitoring Method” (FRL No. 9964-14-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2053. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Correction to Incorporations by Reference” (FRL No. 9963-67-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2054. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Western Mojave Desert, Rate of Progress Demonstration” (FRL No. 9963-86-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2055. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District and the Town of Mammoth Lakes” (FRL No. 9955-67-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2056. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; CFR Update” (FRL No. 9963-70-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2057. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Limited Approval and Limited Disapproval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Mendocino County Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits” (FRL No. 9960-08-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2058. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment to Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries Under CERCLA” (FRL No. 9958-47-OLEM) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2059. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; VT; Infrastructure State Implementation Plan Requirements” (FRL No. 9963-88-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 20, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2060. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval of Section 112(I) Authority for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Equivalency by Permit Provisions; National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants;

Plating and Polishing Operations” (FRL No. 9964-32-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2061. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Revised Format of 40 CFR Part 52 for Materials Being Incorporated by Reference” (FRL No. 9955-06-Region 2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2062. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Rhode Island; Reasonably Available Control Technology for US Watercraft, LLC” (FRL No. 9964-26-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2063. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Revised Format for Materials Incorporated by Reference” (FRL No. 9963-76-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2064. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; FL; Revisions to New Source Review, Definitions and Small Business Assistance Programs” (FRL No. 9964-35-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2065. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; FL; Hillsborough and Nassau Areas; SO2 Attainment Demonstration” (FRL No. 9964-39-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2066. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval and Designation of Areas; KY; Redesignation of the Kentucky Portion of the Cincinnati-Hamilton 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment” (FRL No. 9964-41-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 28, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2067. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Permit Exemptions and Definitions” (FRL No. 9964-06-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2068. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Redesignation of the Collin County Area to Attainment the 2008 Lead Standard” (FRL No.

9963-47-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2069. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Albuquerque/Bernalillo County; New Source Review (NSR) Preconstruction Permitting Program" (FRL No. 9963-41-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2070. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Missouri's Air Quality Implementation Plans; Reporting Emission Date, Emission Fees and Process Information" (FRL No. 9964-04-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2071. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fees for Water Infrastructure Project Applications under WIFIA" ((RIN2040-AF64) (FRL No. 9964-19-OW)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2072. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; GA and SC: Changes to Ambient Air Standards and Definitions" (FRL No. 9964-09-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2073. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Encinitas-Solana Beach Shoreline Coastal Storm Damage Reduction, San Diego County, California, project; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2074. A communication from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to the Congress: Medicare and the Health Care Delivery System"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2075. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Canada and Saudi Arabia to support the design, development, modification, and integration of Enhanced Situational Awareness systems into armored vehicles in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-064); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2076. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services for the sale of one modified G550 aircraft to the government of Israel in the amount of \$50,000,000

or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-106); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2077. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Israel for the manufacture of F-15 aircraft structural components in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-122); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2078. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to the United Kingdom for the manufacture of Joint Strike Fighter subassemblies, components, parts, and associated tooling of the aft fuselage and empennage in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-132); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2079. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of firearms, parts, and accessories abroad controlled under Category I of the United States Munitions List in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-138); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2080. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of various calibers of firearms ammunition to Saudi Arabia in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-003); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2081. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of M400 semi-automatic rifles and P320 semi-automatic pistols and accessories to Jordan in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-004); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2082. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to the United Arab Emirates to support the maintenance, testing, support, field engineering services, logistics management assistance, training, repair, and calibration for three (3) sets of AN/TPS-78 Radar Systems, two (2) sets of TPS-70 Radar Systems, a command, control, and communications system known as the Emirates Air Defense Ground Environment (EADGE), and a low altitude surveillance system known as the Emirates Low Altitude Surveillance System (ELASS) in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-007); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2083. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of M400 5.56 mm rifles and associated parts and components to Jordan in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-011); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2084. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of

State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Japan for the sale and support of AAV7A1 RAM/RS Amphibious Assault Vehicles in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-019); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2085. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to India to support the integration, assembly, and maintenance of M777A2 155mm Lightweight Howitzers in support of an existing Foreign Military Sales Contract in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-023); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2086. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of 5.56mm and 7.62mm carbines, associated training and parts, and accessories to Sweden in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-034); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2087. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of 5.56mm semi-automatic rifles, 9mm caliber rifles, 9mm pistols, silencers, and accessories to Indonesia in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-013); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2088. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to the Republic of Korea for the manufacture, assembly, inspection, and testing of F404-GE-102 engines for the T-50, TA-50, and FA-50 aircraft series for end-use by various countries in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-044); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2089. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Australia, the United Kingdom and the United Arab Emirates to support the marketing, sale, and on-going support of Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) and for future Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) requirements for the United Arab Emirates Armed Forces in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-128); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2090. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of semi-automatic 9mm pistols with extra magazines to Thailand in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-024); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2091. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Germany to support the manufacture, integration, installation, operation, training, testing, maintenance, and repair of the TYTON

line of laser rangefinder targeting devices and component modules (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-060); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2092. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of semi-automatic 9mm pistols with extra magazines and ammunition to Thailand in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-025); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2093. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Taiwan for the MK41 Vertical Launching System in the amount of \$14,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-071); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2094. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Canada to support the manufacture of Precision Optical Subsystems, Optomechanical Major Assemblies, and Optical Components for the AIM-9X Sidewinder Missile in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 17-036); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2095. A communication from the Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2017; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2096. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2017-0113-2017-0122); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

S. 696. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to appropriately limit the authority to award bonuses to Federal employees (Rept. No. 115-127).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 829. A bill to reauthorize the Assistance to Firefighters Grants program, the Fire Prevention and Safety Grants program, and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-128).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1099. A bill to provide for the identification and prevention of improper payments and the identification of strategic sourcing opportunities by reviewing and analyzing the use of Federal agency charge cards (Rept. No. 115-129).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Claire M. Grady, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security.

*Henry Kerner, of California, to be Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, for the term of five years.

By Mr. BARR for the Select Committee on Intelligence.

*David James Glawe, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, Department of Homeland Security.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 1524. A bill to improve the treatment of Federal prisoners who are primary caretaker parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 1525. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to review and score TRIO applications with minor budgeting errors; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1526. A bill to appropriate amounts to the Department of Veterans Affairs to improve the provision of health care to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 1527. A bill to appropriate amounts to the Department of Veterans Affairs to improve the provision of health care to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1528. A bill to amend the market name of genetically altered salmon in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. KING):

S. 1529. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand eligibility for the refundable credit for coverage under a qualified health plan; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASIDY, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1530. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to encourage Medicare beneficiaries to voluntarily adopt advance directives guiding the medical care they receive; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. Res. 217. A resolution welcoming Prime Minister Youssef Chahed of the Tunisian Republic on his first official visit to the United States, congratulating the people of the Tunisian Republic on their embrace of democracy after decades of dictatorship, and encouraging future reforms; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. Res. 218. A resolution celebrating and reaffirming the strategic partnership between the United States and Romania on the twentieth anniversary of its inception; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 200

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 200, a bill to prohibit the conduct of a first-use nuclear strike absent a declaration of war by Congress.

S. 253

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 253, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

S. 372

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 372, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to ensure that merchandise arriving through the mail shall be subject to review by U.S. Customs and Border Protection and to require the provision of advance electronic information on shipments of mail to U.S. Customs and Border Protection and for other purposes.

S. 617

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 617, a bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Farmington River and Salmon Brook in the State of Connecticut as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

S. 756

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr.

PORTMAN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 756, a bill to reauthorize and amend the Marine Debris Act to promote international action to reduce marine debris, and for other purposes.

S. 839

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 839, a bill to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with such rule.

S. 845

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 845, a bill to protect sensitive community locations from harmful immigration enforcement action, and for other purposes.

S. 872

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 872, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 910

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 910, a bill to prohibit discrimination against individuals with disabilities who need long-term services and supports, and for other purposes.

S. 985

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 985, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from revising the approved oil and gas leasing program for fiscal years 2017 through 2022.

S. 1015

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1015, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to study the feasibility of designating a simple, easy-to-remember dialing code to be used for a national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system.

S. 1122

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1122, a bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to clarify when the time period for the

issuance of citations under such Act begins and to require a rule to clarify that an employer's duty to make and maintain accurate records of work-related injuries and illnesses is an ongoing obligation.

S. 1132

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1132, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the removal of the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare program with respect to speech generating devices.

S. 1151

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1151, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a non-refundable credit for working family caregivers.

S. 1182

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1182, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

S. 1274

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1274, a bill to direct the President to establish an interagency mechanism to coordinate United States development programs and private sector investment activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1276

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1276, a bill to require the Attorney General to make a determination as to whether cannabidiol should be a controlled substance and listed in a schedule under the Controlled Substances Act and to expand research on the potential medical benefits of cannabidiol and other marijuana components.

S. 1292

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1292, a bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to monitor and combat anti-Semitism globally, and for other purposes.

S. 1348

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 1348, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require drug manufacturers to publicly justify unnecessary price increases.

S. 1403

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1403, a bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to establish the 21st Century Conservation Service Corps to place youth and veterans in national service positions to conserve, restore, and enhance the great outdoors of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1414

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1414, a bill to state the policy of the United States on the minimum number of available battle force ships.

S. 1462

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1462, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to improve cost sharing subsidies.

S. 1474

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1474, a bill to prohibit the use of fiscal year 2018 funds for the closure, consolidation, or elimination of certain offices of the Environmental Protection Agency.

S. 1520

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1520, a bill to expand recreational fishing opportunities through enhanced marine fishery conservation and management, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 21

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 21, a concurrent resolution urging the Government of the People's Republic of China to unconditionally release Liu Xiaobo, together with his wife Liu Xia, to allow them to freely meet with friends, family, and counsel and seek medical treatment wherever they desire.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 75, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, the largest organization of food and nutrition professionals in the world.

S. RES. 154

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 154, a resolution promoting awareness of motorcycle profiling and encouraging collaboration and communication with the motorcycle community and law enforcement officials to prevent instances of profiling.

S. RES. 214

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 214, a resolution designating June 19, 2017, as “Juneteenth Independence Day” in recognition of June 19, 1865, the date on which slavery legally came to an end in the United States.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 1524. A bill to improve the treatment of Federal prisoners who are primary caretaker parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I rise to introduce the Dignity for Incarcerated Women Act (Dignity Act), a critical criminal justice reform bill that would provide much needed reforms to address the unique needs women face in Federal prisons. This legislation helps shed light on the unique challenges women face behind bars, which seldom receive the attention they deserve in our criminal justice reform efforts. It is time we begin to remedy the barriers incarcerated women face, and that’s what this bill would do. I thank Senators WARREN, DURBIN, and HARRIS for cosponsoring this bill, and I am proud to have their support.

America is truly exceptional when it comes to incarceration. The United States has 5 percent of the world’s population and 25 percent of the globe’s prison population. Since 1980, our Federal population has grown by nearly 800 percent.

But let’s look specifically at incarcerated women. Only 5 percent of the world’s female population live in the United States, but nearly 30 percent of the world’s incarcerated women are in our Nation—twice the percentage of China and four times as much as Russia. Since 1978, the number of women incarcerated in State and Federal prisons in the United States has increased by 716 percent, twice the growth rate of men. America currently has 110,000 women behind bars, and women account for a larger proportion of the prison population than ever before in our Nation’s history.

The numbers of women in our Federal prisons has seen substantial growth. Although women represent a small percentage of Federal prisoners, the proportion of women in the Federal system rose from 12.1 percent in fiscal

year 2009 to 13.3 percent in fiscal year 2013. Based on the most recent Sentencing Commission data, 9,400 women were in Federal prisons as of fiscal year 2013. In 2013, more than two-thirds of women in Federal prison were behind bars due to nonviolent drug, fraud, or immigration crimes and over 70 percent of women in Federal prisons had little or no prior criminal history.

An urgent need exists to address the unique challenges women face while behind bars. Women are often primary caretaker parents, meaning their incarceration impacts children. Incarcerated women face the unconscionable choice of either calling home to talk to their children or using commissary funds to buy sanitary napkins. Women in prison are frequently victims of trauma. According to data from Vera Institute of Justice, women in jails face high-levels of trauma: 86 percent experienced sexual violence, 77 percent report partner violence, and 60 percent were survivors of caregiver violence. These troubling statistics deserve our attention.

Today, I’m proud to introduce the Dignity Act, a comprehensive bill that would begin to remedy the unique challenges faced by women behind bars. The bill would require the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) to consider the location of children when placing an incarcerated parent in a Federal prison, which helps alleviate the great distances children and other loved ones often have to travel to visit incarcerated parents.

The bill would mandate the BOP create more generous and uniform visitation hours for primary caretaker parents to provide more easy access to loved ones while a woman is behind bars. We know family visitation is a critical part of a successful reentry strategy, so this commonsense provision would help maintain family contact when parents are behind bars. As a result, this provision makes it less likely that returning citizens commit crimes, which would enhance public safety.

The Dignity Act would ban solitary confinement and shackling of pregnant women in Federal prison. Studies confirm serious psychological and physical harm are likely to occur when these harsh practices are used on pregnant women. It is time we ban the use of solitary and shackling on pregnant women and treat these women with the dignity and respect they deserve.

The bill would also require the BOP to provide parenting classes to primary caretaker parents, provide trauma-informed care to victims of trauma, and allow returning citizens to mentor incarcerated people. It would mandate the BOP train correctional officers in how to identify trauma victims in prison. This bill would help ensure people behind bars receive the critical programming they need to prepare for reentry into society.

The Dignity Act contains numerous other reforms. It would create an om-

budsman at the Department of Justice to look into abuses associated with solitary confinement, prisoner transportation, strip searches, and other civil rights abuses. The bill would require the BOP to eliminate prison phone rates and mandate all prisons be equipped with video conferencing, which the bill ensures would be made available free of charge to incarcerated people. The legislation would require the BOP to make certain health products available for free, such as sanitary napkins, toothpaste, and ibuprofen.

Other reforms in the bill would preclude correctional officers of the opposite gender of the incarcerated individual from conducting strip searches or entering a restroom of the opposite gender. The bill has a common-sense exception for when an incarcerated woman’s health is in danger and for other exigent circumstances. The bill would require the BOP to allow primary caretaker parents access to the Residential Drug Abuse Program, a critical drug treatment program, even if they fail to admit to having a substance abuse disorder prior to their incarceration. Finally, the Dignity Act would require the BOP to create a pilot program for overnight visits for incarcerated parents and children.

The legislation has broad support from organizations like the National Council for Incarcerated and Formerly Incarcerated Women and Girls, the ACLU, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, and the Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law.

The Dignity Act would provide critical reforms to address challenges women behind bars face. Again, I thank Senators WARREN, DURBIN, and HARRIS for their leadership. I am proud to introduce this important criminal justice reform bill, and I urge my colleagues to support its speedy passage.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 217—WELCOMING PRIME MINISTER YOUSSEF CHAHED OF THE TUNISIAN REPUBLIC ON HIS FIRST OFFICIAL VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES, CONGRATULATING THE PEOPLE OF THE TUNISIAN REPUBLIC ON THEIR EMBRACE OF DEMOCRACY AFTER DECADES OF DICTATORSHIP, AND ENCOURAGING FUTURE REFORMS

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COONS, Mr. Kaine, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 217

Whereas, on December 17, 2010, Mohammad Bouazizi, a young fruit vendor in Sidi Bouzid, set himself on fire to protest his unjust treatment by the regime of Tunisian

President Zine al Abidine Ben Ali, and in his death inspired the “Jasmine Revolution” in the Tunisian Republic and popular revolutions across the Arab world of citizens demanding transparency, reform, and representation;

Whereas, on January 14, 2011, the peaceful mass protests of the Jasmine Revolution successfully brought to an end the authoritarian rule of President Ben Ali;

Whereas, in the aftermath of Ben Ali’s resignation, Tunisians initiated a peaceful, consensus-based, inclusive, and civilian-directed transition to democracy;

Whereas, on January 26, 2014, the Tunisian Republic adopted its first constitution drafted by a democratically elected governing body, formally ending a period of transitional governments;

Whereas the new constitution of the Tunisian Republic enshrines gender equality through enumerated rights and responsibilities, protects the rights of minorities, and specifically outlaws religiously motivated violence;

Whereas, on October 26, 2014, the Tunisian Republic held its first parliamentary elections under the new constitution, which the international community praised as free and fair;

Whereas, on December 31, 2014, after winning free and fair presidential elections, Beiji Caid Essebsi was inaugurated as the first freely elected President of the Tunisian Republic;

Whereas, on October 9, 2015, the Norwegian Nobel Committee awarded the Tunisian National Dialogue Quartet, a coalition of four civil society organizations, the 2015 Nobel Peace Prize for the coalition’s work in building on the promise of the 2011 Jasmine Revolution and ensuring the transition of the Tunisian Republic into a democracy did not descend into violence;

Whereas President Essebsi, Prime Minister Chahed, and other political leaders of the Tunisian Republic have formed a national unity government to work in the national interest of the Tunisian Republic;

Whereas the political evolution of the Tunisian Republic stands as a model for citizens of other states aspiring to establish the institutions of democracy after a history of autocratic rule;

Whereas, on March 18, 2015, a terrorist attack on the Bardo National Museum killed 21 people;

Whereas, on July 26, 2015, a terrorist attack on a beach in the town of Sousse left 38 people, including 30 British nationals, dead, and dealt a blow to tourism in the Tunisian Republic, an important industry upon which the economy of the Tunisian Republic depends;

Whereas a terrorist attack on November 24, 2015, on the Presidential Guard of the Tunisian Republic killed 12 people;

Whereas, in the aftermath of these attacks, citizens and leaders of the Tunisian Republic have reaffirmed their commitment to dialogue, pluralism, and democracy;

Whereas the Tunisian Republic continues to face serious threats to its security from violent extremist groups operating within the Tunisian Republic as well as in neighboring countries;

Whereas, in July 2015, the United States designated the Tunisian Republic as a major non-NATO ally;

Whereas the Government of the Tunisian Republic, as a member of the Global Coalition to Counter the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), is seeking to reduce the significant number of Tunisian citizens who become foreign fighters for ISIS;

Whereas the Tunisian Republic faces economic challenges, including high inflation

and high unemployment, especially among young Tunisians;

Whereas Prime Minister Chahed has committed to combating corruption and facilitating necessary economic reforms for the prosperity of the people of the Tunisian Republic;

Whereas the United States Government is committed to continuing a strong economic partnership with the Tunisian Republic as the Government of the Tunisian Republic undertakes reforms to transform its economy to meet the aspirations of all citizens of the Tunisian Republic;

Whereas it is the interest of the United States, and consistent with the values of the United States, to support the aspirations of the people of the Tunisian Republic in developing a pluralist democracy and transparent, effective institutions;

Whereas the Governments and people of the United States and the Tunisian Republic have enjoyed friendly relations for more than 200 years;

Whereas, in accordance with the U.S.–Tunisia Strategic Partnership, both countries are dedicated to working together to promote economic development and business opportunities in the Tunisian Republic, education for the advancement of long-term development in the Tunisian Republic, and increased security cooperation to address common threats in the Tunisian Republic and across the region; and

Whereas the United States Government should provide a level of funding to strongly assist and reinforce the promising transition of the Tunisian Republic into a democratic, stable, and prosperous nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) welcomes Prime Minister Chahed on his first official visit to the United States;

(2) commends the political leaders of the Tunisian Republic for their willingness to compromise and work together in the national interest and form a national unity government;

(3) reaffirms the commitment of the United States Government to the Tunisian Republic, including a commitment to provide appropriate levels of assistance, in support of the ongoing transition of the Tunisian Republic to an inclusive, prosperous, and secure democracy;

(4) condemns all acts of terrorism, and extends condolences to the families of victims of terrorism and to the people and Government of the Tunisian Republic.

(5) commends the people and Government of the Tunisian Republic for their resilience in the face of terrorist attacks and their enduring commitment to a free, democratic, and peaceful Tunisian Republic;

(6) encourages Prime Minister Chahed and the parliament of the Tunisian Republic to work together to accelerate economic reforms and anti-corruption measures;

(7) looks forward to the continued implementation of the 2014 constitution of the Tunisian Republic, including the new protections of civil liberties;

(8) urges the authorities of the Tunisian Republic to continue to make every effort to prevent the continued flow of Tunisian jihadist “foreign fighters” to Syria and Iraq;

(9) calls on the neighbors and partners of the Tunisian Republic to work in concert with the Government of the Tunisian Republic to counter terrorist threats, secure borders, and support the democratic transition of the Tunisian Republic;

(10) strongly urges the Government of the Tunisian Republic to cease support for all resolutions and other measures that discriminate against or otherwise target Israel in the United Nations Education, Science,

and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and other United Nations organizations; and

(11) reaffirms the historic and continuing friendship between the people of the United States and the people of the Tunisian Republic.

SENATE RESOLUTION 218—CELEBRATING AND REAFFIRMING THE STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND ROMANIA ON THE TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF ITS INCEPTION

Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 218

Whereas, in 1997, the Governments of the United States and Romania embarked upon a strategic partnership rooted in our mutual embrace of popular sovereignty, individual rights, free markets, and the rule of law, and our commitment to transatlantic security and prosperity;

Whereas the Government of Romania has striven to advance security and democratic principles in Southeast Europe, and has participated actively in building a Europe whole, free, and at peace;

Whereas the strategic partnership between the United States and Romania has helped forge durable economic and cultural bonds between our two countries;

Whereas the Government of Romania recently announced that it will raise defense spending to two percent of its gross domestic product (GDP) in 2017 in order to meet the minimum level of defense expenditures pledged at the 2014 NATO Wales Summit;

Whereas NATO’s first “Aegis Ashore” missile defense installation became operational on May 12, 2016, at Deveselu Base in Romania, representing a significant increase in NATO’s capacity to defend against ballistic missile threats outside the Euro-Atlantic zone;

Whereas the Romanian Armed Forces have supported NATO and United States operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other theaters for over a decade, contributing more than 30,000 total combat and support personnel to those missions;

Whereas Romania maintains the fifth largest contingent in NATO’s Resolute Support Mission in Afghanistan, with over 600 troops helping to train, advise, and assist the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF) and Afghan security institutions;

Whereas Romania is a member of the Global Coalition to Defeat ISIS and has deployed military trainers to Iraq to train Iraqi Security Forces and provided humanitarian assistance to the people of Iraq and Syria;

Whereas the people and Governments of the United States and Romania share a common interest in deepening our economic relationship through increased bilateral trade and investment and projecting economic stability and prosperity across Southeast Europe;

Whereas, in October 2017, Romania will host the tenth annual United States Commercial Service Trade Winds Forum and Trade Mission, helping United States companies explore new opportunities in Romania and across Southeast Europe;

Whereas the Governments of the United States and Romania are working closely together to develop an ambitious bilateral economic, trade, and investment agenda, including through a record attendance this year by Romanian companies to the United States SelectUSA Summit;

Whereas the talent, energy, and creativity of the Romanian people have nurtured a vibrant society, embracing innovation and entrepreneurship, and inspiring new generations of young Romanian leaders in business, technology and advanced sciences;

Whereas the Government of Romania is setting a positive example through its continued efforts to defend the rule of law, to strengthen judicial independence, and to fight against corruption, notably through the work of Romania's National Anticorruption Directorate (DNA);

Whereas the rich heritage of many generations of Romanian-Americans have made indelible contributions to America's cultural tapestry; and

Whereas 2018 will mark the Centennial Anniversary of Romanian unification, a milestone to be lauded and celebrated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates 20 years of close, strategic partnership between the United States and Romania and applauds Romania's significant contributions and commitment to transatlantic security and prosperity;

(2) commends the Government of Romania for its advancements in democratic governance, the rule of law, and a principled and inclusive society which provides opportunities for development and growth, and urges continued progress in these areas; and

(3) affirms the desire of the Senate to continue strengthening the strategic partnership between the United States and Romania and to inspire future generations of young leaders to cherish, preserve, and develop the friendship between our two nations.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 256. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1519, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 256. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1519, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title XII, insert the following:

Subtitle—Syrian War Crimes Accountability Act of 2017

SEC. 12 1. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the "Syrian War Crimes Accountability Act of 2017".

SEC. 12 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) March 2017 marks the sixth year of the ongoing conflict in Syria.

(2) As of February 2017—

(A) more than 600,000 people are living under siege in Syria;

(B) approximately 6,300,000 people are displaced from their homes inside Syria; and

(C) approximately 4,900,000 Syrians have fled to neighboring countries as refugees.

(3) Since the conflict in Syria began, the United States has provided more than \$5,900,000,000 to meet humanitarian needs in Syria, making the United States the world's single largest donor by far to the Syrian humanitarian response.

(4) In response to growing concerns over systemic human rights violations in Syria, the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic (referred to in this section as "COI") was established on August 22, 2011. The purpose of COI is to "investigate all alleged violations of international human rights law since March 2011 in the Syrian Arab Republic, to establish the facts and circumstances that may amount to such violations and of the crimes perpetrated and, where possible, to identify those responsible with a view to ensuring that perpetrators of violations, including those that may constitute crimes against humanity, are held accountable".

(5) On December 21, 2016, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution to establish the International, Impartial and Independent Mechanism to Assist in the Investigation and Prosecution of Those Responsible for the Most Serious Crimes under International Law Committed in the Syrian Arab Republic since March 2011.

(6) The 2016 United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Annual Report states that in Syria "[r]eports have emerged from all groups, including Muslims, Christians, Ismailis, and others, of gross human rights violations, including beheading, rape, murder, torture of civilians and religious figures, and the destruction of mosques and churches."

(7) On February 7, 2017, Amnesty International reported that between 5,000 and 13,000 people were extrajudicially executed in the Saydnaya Military Prison between September 2011 and December 2015.

(8) In February 2017, COI released a report—

(A) stating that a joint United Nations-Syrian Arab Red Crescent convoy in Orum al-Kubra, Syria, was attacked by air on September 19, 2016;

(B) explaining that the attack killed at least 14 civilian aid workers, injured at least 15 others, and destroyed trucks, food, medicine, clothes, and other supplies; and

(C) concluding that "the attack was meticulously planned and ruthlessly carried out by the Syrian air force to purposefully hinder the delivery of humanitarian aid and target aid workers, constituting the war crimes of deliberately attacking humanitarian relief personnel, denial of humanitarian aid and targeting civilians."

(9) On October 21, 2016, the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons-United Nations Joint Investigative Mechanism transmitted its fourth report, which concluded that the Syrian Arab Armed Forces and the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS) have both used chemical weapons against villages in Syria.

(10) On August 11, 2016, COI released a report stating that certain offenses, including deliberately attacking hospitals, executions without due process, and the massive and systematized nature of deaths in state-controlled detention facilities in Syria, constitute war crimes and crimes against humanity.

(11) Physicians for Human Rights reported that, between March 2011 and the end of December 2016, Syrian government and allied forces—

(A) had committed 412 attacks on medical facilities (including through the use of indiscriminate barrel bombs on at least 80 occasions); and

(B) had killed 735 medical personnel.

(12) The Department of State's 2016 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices—

(A) details President Bashar al-Assad's use of "indiscriminate and deadly force against civilians, conducting air and ground-based military assaults on cities, residential areas, and civilian infrastructure";

(B) explains that "these attacks included bombardment with improvised explosive devices, commonly referred to as 'barrel bombs' . . ."; and

(C) reports that "[t]he government [of Syria] continued the use of torture and rape, including of children".

(13) On March 17, 2016, Secretary of State John Kerry stated: "In my judgment, Daesh is responsible for genocide against groups in areas under its control, including Yezidis, Christians, and Shia Muslims. . . . The United States will strongly support efforts to collect, document, preserve, and analyze the evidence of atrocities, and we will do all we can to see that the perpetrators are held accountable."

(14) In February 2016, COI reported that—

(A) "crimes against humanity continue to be committed by [Syrian] Government forces and by ISIS";

(B) the Syrian government has "committed the crimes against humanity of extermination, murder, rape or other forms of sexual violence, torture, imprisonment, enforce disappearance and other inhuman acts"; and

(C) "[a]ccountability for these and other crimes must form part of any political solution".

(15) Credible civil society organizations collecting evidence of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide in Syria report that at least 12 countries in western Europe and North America have requested assistance on investigating such crimes.

SEC. 12 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

Congress—

(1) strongly condemns—

(A) the ongoing violence, use of chemical weapons, targeting of civilian populations with barrel, incendiary, and cluster bombs and SCUD missiles, and systematic gross human rights violations carried out by the Government of Syria and pro-government forces under the direction of President Bashar al-Assad; and

(B) all abuses committed by violent extremist groups and other combatants involved in the civil war in Syria;

(2) expresses its support for the people of Syria seeking democratic change;

(3) urges all parties to the conflict—

(A) to immediately halt indiscriminate attacks on civilians;

(B) to allow for the delivery of humanitarian and medical assistance; and

(C) to end sieges of civilian populations;

(4) calls on the President to support efforts in Syria, and on the part of the international community, to ensure accountability for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide committed during the conflict; and

(5) supports the request in United Nations Security Council Resolutions 2139 (2014), 2165 (2014), and 2191 (2014) for the Secretary-General to regularly report to the Security Council on implementation of the resolutions, including of paragraph 2 of Resolution 2139, which "demands that all parties immediately put an end to all forms of violence [and] cease and desist from all violations of international humanitarian law and violations and abuses of human rights".

SEC. 12 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(E) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(F) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) GENOCIDE.—The term “genocide” means any offense described in section 1091(a) of title 18, United States Code.

(3) HYBRID TRIBUNAL.—The term “hybrid tribunal” means a temporary criminal tribunal that involves a combination of domestic and international lawyers, judges, and other professionals to prosecute individuals suspected of committing war crimes, crimes against humanity, or genocide.

(4) TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE.—The term “transitional justice” means the range of judicial, nonjudicial, formal, informal, retributive, and restorative measures employed by countries transitioning out of armed conflict or repressive regimes—

(A) to redress legacies of atrocities; and

(B) to promote long-term, sustainable peace.

(5) WAR CRIME.—The term “war crime” has the meaning given the term in section 2441(c) of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 12 5. REPORT ON ACCOUNTABILITY FOR WAR CRIMES, CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY, AND GENOCIDE IN SYRIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall submit a report on war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide in Syria to the appropriate congressional committees not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and another such report not later than 180 days after the Secretary of State determines that the violence in Syria has ceased.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The reports required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of alleged war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide perpetrated during the civil war in Syria, including—

(A) incidents that may constitute war crimes, crimes against humanity, or genocide committed by the regime of President Bashar al-Assad and all forces fighting on its behalf;

(B) incidents that may constitute war crimes, crimes against humanity, or genocide committed by violent extremist groups, anti-government forces, and any other combatants in the conflict;

(C) any incidents that may violate the principle of medical neutrality and, if possible, the identification of the individual or individuals who engaged in or organized such incidents; and

(D) if possible, a description of the conventional and unconventional weapons used for such crimes and the origins of such weapons; and

(2) a description and assessment by the Department of State Office of Global Criminal Justice, the United States Agency for International Development, the Department of Justice, and other appropriate agencies of programs that the United States Government has undertaken to ensure accountability for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide perpetrated against the people of Syria by the regime of President Bashar al-Assad, violent extremist groups, and other combatants involved in the conflict, including programs—

(A) to train investigators within and outside of Syria on how to document, investigate, develop findings of, and identify and locate alleged perpetrators of war crimes, crimes against humanity, or genocide, including—

(i) the number of United States Government or contract personnel currently designated to work full-time on these issues; and

(ii) the identification of the authorities and appropriations being used to support such training efforts;

(B) to promote and prepare for a transitional justice process or processes for the perpetrators of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide in Syria beginning in March 2011;

(C) to document, collect, preserve, and protect evidence of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide in Syria, including support for Syrian, foreign, and international nongovernmental organizations, and other entities, including the International, Impartial and Independent Mechanism to Assist in the Investigation and Prosecution of Persons Responsible for the Most Serious Crimes under International Law Committed in the Syrian Arab Republic since March 2011 and the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic; and

(D) to assess the influence of accountability measures on efforts to reach a negotiated settlement to the Syrian conflict during the reporting period.

(c) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) may be submitted in unclassified or classified form, but shall include a publicly available annex.

(d) PROTECTION OF WITNESSES AND EVIDENCE.—The Secretary shall take due care to ensure that the identification of witnesses and physical evidence are not publicly disclosed in a manner that might place such persons at risk of harm or encourage the destruction of evidence by the Government of Syria, violent extremist groups, anti-government forces, or any other combatants or participants in the conflict.

SEC. 12 6. TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE STUDY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State (acting through appropriate officials and offices, which may include the Office of Global Criminal Justice), after consultation with the Department of Justice, the United States Agency for International Development, and other appropriate Federal agencies, shall—

(1) complete a study of the feasibility and desirability of potential transitional justice mechanisms for Syria, including a hybrid tribunal, to address war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide perpetrated in Syria beginning in March 2011; and

(2) submit a detailed report of the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1), including recommendations on which transitional justice mechanisms the United States Government should support, why such mechanisms should be supported, and what type of support should be offered, to—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(C) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 12 7. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State (acting through appropriate officials and offices, which may include the Office of Global Criminal Justice), after consultation with the Department of Justice and other appropriate Federal agencies, is authorized to provide appropriate assistance to support entities that, with respect to war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide perpetrated by the regime of President Bashar al-Assad,

all forces fighting on its behalf, and all non-state armed groups fighting in the country, including violent extremist groups in Syria beginning in March 2011—

(1) identify suspected perpetrators of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide;

(2) collect, document, and protect evidence of crimes and preserve the chain of custody for such evidence;

(3) conduct criminal investigations;

(4) build Syria’s investigative and judicial capacities and support prosecutions in the domestic courts of Syria, provided that President Bashar al-Assad is no longer in power;

(5) support investigations by third-party states, as appropriate; or

(6) protect witnesses that may be helpful to prosecutions or other transitional justice mechanisms.

(b) ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of State, after consultation with appropriate Federal agencies and the appropriate congressional committees, and taking into account the findings of the transitional justice study required under section 12 6, is authorized to provide assistance to support the creation and operation of transitional justice mechanisms, including a potential hybrid tribunal, to prosecute individuals suspected of committing war crimes, crimes against humanity, or genocide in Syria beginning in March 2011.

(c) BRIEFING.—The Secretary of State shall provide detailed, biannual briefings to the appropriate congressional committees describing the assistance provided to entities described in subsection (a).

SEC. 12 8. STATE DEPARTMENT REWARDS FOR JUSTICE PROGRAM.

Section 36(b)(10) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2708(b)(10)) is amended by inserting “(including war crimes, crimes against humanity, or genocide committed in Syria beginning in March 2011)” after “genocide”.

SEC. 12 9. INDEPENDENT INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY ON THE SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC.

The Secretary of State, acting through the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations, should use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the United Nations to advocate that the United Nations Human Rights Council, while the United States remains a member, annually extend the mandate of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic until the Commission has completed its investigation of all alleged violations of international human rights laws beginning in March 2011 in the Syrian Arab Republic.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I have 7 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 11, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in open session to consider the nomination of: Mr. Richard V. Spencer to be Secretary of the Navy.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 11, 2017 at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled "Nominations."

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 11, 2017, at 10 a.m. for a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Tuesday, July 11, 2017 from 2:15 p.m.–2:30 p.m. in Room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold a closed business meeting to consider the nomination of Mr. David Glawe to be Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis at the Department of Homeland Security.

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Tuesday, July 11, 2017 from 2:30 p.m.–4:00 p.m. in Room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold a closed hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 11, 2017, at 2:30 p.m. in SR-418, to conduct a hearing on legislation pending before the Committee.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME AND TERRORISM

The Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism, is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on July 11, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in Room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Concurrent Congressional and Criminal Investigations: Lessons from History."

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Gloria Ramirez, be granted privileges of the floor for the balance of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 12, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 noon, Wednesday, July 12; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consider-

ation of the Nye nomination with all postcloture time being expired; finally, that if cloture is invoked on the Hagerty nomination, the time count as if cloture were invoked at 1 a.m., Wednesday, July 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators SANDERS, VAN HOLLEN, and BLUMENTHAL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Connecticut.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I come to the floor today after a fourth field hearing in Connecticut. Every one of those field hearings has been packed. I spent time at a Planned Parenthood clinic in Hartford, as well as having visited others over the past year. I have spent time with numerous providers and at community health centers and heard firsthand from the people of Connecticut as to why the Republican health bill, which has been unveiled after having been concocted behind closed doors, would devastate the health and finances of Connecticut's families and their communities.

The bill that we expect to be disclosed later this week will almost certainly be defective in the same ways as the bills that we have seen. To call these proposals mean or heartless, as the President has, is a gross understatement. The bill, very simply put, would cost both dollars and lives, eroding not just our ability to save money by investing in a healthier future but causing death and despair when neither term is really necessary. This wound would be self-inflicted, but it is a wound that is preventable and avoidable.

I pledge to the people of Connecticut that I will fight as long and as hard as necessary to stop this grotesquely cruel and costly proposal.

It is not, in fact, a healthcare bill. It is a wealth care bill. It decimates Medicaid, saving, supposedly, close to \$1 billion so that those savings can be used for tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. As Warren Buffett has said—and he is one of them—"I don't need it." He would rather see it be used for better healthcare and coverage, and that is what the majority of Americans want. That is why this proposal is so deeply unpopular.

Now, after weeks of secrecy, followed by chaos, we are back to secrecy again, with Republicans retreating away from their constituents and going behind closed doors. Even over this past week, when we were back in our home States, they were crafting another bill. We

have not seen it. We have not debated it. We cannot even say that we know anything about what is in it, and my Republican colleagues know little more than we do on this side of the aisle. We know for sure, despite the secrecy, that the devastating effect would be overwhelming on people across income strata, geographic boundaries, and cultural backgrounds.

I am here not to talk in abstractions. I am here to talk about real people in real life and to share the stories that I heard at these field hearings—people's stories that they have entrusted me to bring to you. Many of my colleagues have refused to hear these stories from their constituents because they would hear how repugnant and repulsive this bill is and how deeply angry the people of the country are. The people of Connecticut and the country are outraged.

The reason is people like Ariella Botts, and here she is. Ariella is 4 years old. She came to my field hearing last week with her mom, Rachel. Ariella, as her mom told me, has nemaline myopathy, which is a rare form of muscular dystrophy. Their family relies on Medicaid for her care. I want to tell you exactly what Rachel said about Ariella and their family, because her words are far more eloquent and powerful than mine.

Rachel said:

The fact of the matter is that my daughter's care would cost over \$20,000 a month out of pocket between her food, her medication, her care, and the breathing machines that keep her lungs clear. There is no average American family that can pay \$20,000 a month of medical costs. We do our part. We have two jobs a piece. We do everything we can do. This is the only thing we ask for help on.

Rachel went on to say:

Supporters of the Trumpcare bill want you to believe that costs are high because there is this nameless and faceless abuser of the system, but I have spent hours in the waiting rooms of Yale New Haven Hospital and Connecticut Children's Medical Center. I have spent hours in the neonatal intensive care units and the emergency rooms, and I can tell you that the people who are accessing care on my level—they're not abusers.

I am going to continue quoting Rachel. I cannot really speak with the same power and authenticity that she has, but we are not allowed to show videos here on the floor.

She continued:

We're mothers and fathers who know that there's more for our children to achieve. We're tax-paying, community-investing, voting, involved warriors for our families.

I asked Rachel what would happen to her family if Ariella did not have Medicaid, and Rachel said: "It would bankrupt us in less than a month."

I want to tell you what it is like to spend just a little bit of time with Ariella. She is the most vivacious, animated, beautiful girl, and you would not know anything about her condition but for this apparatus, which is there so she can lead a normal or a near-normal life and be the wonderful young lady that she is. I smile when I think of

her at this hearing because she brought smiles to all of our faces. I understand the joy and pride that she brings to her family because she is one courageous, strong child, and we are proud of her.

Rachel and Ariella were not the only people I heard from whose lives have been made not just better but, truly, whose lives have been made possible by Medicaid.

Jeff Pabon was also at a hearing that I held, and he told me about his family when he was growing up. As a single mother, his mom raised him and his four siblings. As a member of the working class, Jeff told me “she needed as much assistance from the system as the system could provide.” Years later, as an adult, Jeff proudly served our country in the U.S. Navy during Operation Desert Storm. He now has a family of his own, including a son with autism. He spoke out at my hearing because, as he said, “I’ve fought for this country before.”

What Jeff told me touches the core—the heart—of this debate, and I want to read it here on the Senate floor because he said it so powerfully:

The healthcare bill being crafted in secrecy by a minority of Republican Senators now threatens Medicaid protections and aims to provide tax breaks for the ultra wealthy, top 1 percent of America. I would like to see sensible, bipartisan legislation which serves the majority of Americans, like the other 99 percent. Let’s repair the provisions of the Affordable Care Act that need reparation. We need to be moving forward, not backward.

Jeff is right, and so is Rachel. How absurd and reprehensible that costs will rise astronomically while Medicaid funding and the number of those with insurance coverage will go down, just so our Nation’s richest can see billions of dollars in tax cuts—laughable, if it were not so deadly serious. “Deadly” is the word because this bill will cost lives. We rarely deal in life and death issues in this Chamber. This issue is one of them.

It will decimate the lives and livelihoods of so many and threaten not only Ariella but many like her of all ages—the senior who goes into a nursing home after exhausting her life savings and depends on Medicaid, the woman who goes to a Planned Parenthood clinic to be screened for cancer and finds that this pernicious disease has been detected because of that preventive step and the availability of healthcare at Planned Parenthood, the opioid addict who suffers from that disorder or disease—it is a disease, not a moral failing—and seeks recovery through the medicine that is made available by Medicaid. Forty-four percent of all of the medication for opioid addiction treatment comes from Medicaid in the State of Connecticut. All of them are at risk. It is not just their convenience or their comfort. Their lives are at risk.

I heard their stories, and I am haunted by them. I can hear their voices, and I can see their faces. I want my colleagues to do the same. I am ready to

do what Jeff asked of me. I am ready to work with all of my colleagues—Democrat and Republican—to move us forward, not backward. Let’s work together in a bipartisan way to fix the parts of our healthcare insurance system that need repair. Let’s go forward, not backward.

I am eager for the call from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that offers solutions—not repeal but real solutions—as to what the American people need, want, and deserve.

First, we must bury the efforts to decimate Medicaid, to defund Planned Parenthood, and to repeal the Affordable Care Act. We have a chance right now to improve healthcare—a moment, an historic opportunity—and we must seize it. I feel that we are on the cusp of that dramatic and historic moment, and I look forward to working with my colleagues across the aisle.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me be as clear as I can be. The so-called healthcare bill that passed in the House of Representatives several months ago, strongly supported by President Trump, is the most anti-working-class legislation that I have ever seen. The Senate bill, also supported by Mr. Trump, in some respects is even worse.

At a time when working families in Vermont and all across this country are working longer hours for low wages—many people in my own State are working two or three jobs just to bring in enough income to maintain a family—this legislation will cause devastating harm to millions of our families from one end of America to the other.

The American people are united. This weekend I was in West Virginia and Kentucky—so-called conservative States—but I tell you that what is true there, what is true in Vermont, and what is true all over this country is that the American people are standing up and saying loudly and clearly that we will not allow 22 million Americans to be thrown off of the health insurance they currently have in order to give over \$500 billion in tax breaks to the wealthiest 2 percent, to the drug companies, to the insurance companies, and to other profitable corporations. We will not support a bill that takes from the most vulnerable people in our country—the children, the elderly, the disabled, the sick, and the poor—in order to make the very, very rich even richer. This is unconscionable, un-American, and the American people will not accept it.

Plainly stated, this so-called healthcare bill is really nothing more than a massive transfer of wealth from the working families of this country to the very rich. While this bill contains massive cuts to Medicaid; while seniors will pay far, far more in premiums; while Planned Parenthood will be

defunded, the 400 highest income taxpayers, most of whom are billionaires, will get about \$33 billion in tax cuts.

There is no State in this country—none, not the most conservative—that thinks that you throw 22 million people off of health insurance, including disabled children, in order to give \$33 billion in tax breaks to the wealthiest 400 Americans. At a time when so many people in America are struggling, the very wealthy are already doing phenomenally well. They do not need more tax breaks.

Not only is this bill a disaster, but the secretive, backroom process by which it has been written is unprecedented and literally beyond belief. That is not just me speaking; I think a number of my Republican colleagues who disagree with me on everything make that point as well. This bill impacts one-sixth of our economy—over \$3 trillion—and by definition, dealing with healthcare, it impacts virtually every American. Yet the discussions and negotiations on this legislation have never been made public. In fact, I suspect they are going on right now—not here on the floor but behind closed doors.

Unbelievably, with legislation that would completely revamp our healthcare system, there have been no doctors, no nurses, no hospital administrators, no representatives of senior citizens, no experts on the opioid crisis—which is sweeping our country—who have testified in public about the impact this legislation will have in our country. How can one possibly dream of drafting a bill of such enormous magnitude without hearing one public comment from the most knowledgeable people in America with regard to healthcare?

How can you possibly go forward without one public hearing where Senators have the opportunity—Democrats, progressives, Independents—to ask questions? But that is precisely the process this legislation has gone through.

I fully understand there are a lot of people who will say: Well, big surprise, BERNIE SANDERS, a strong progressive, opposes this Republican bill. What else is new?

But I want you all to understand that it is not just BERNIE SANDERS or Democrats here who oppose this legislation; this legislation is opposed by virtually every major healthcare organization in the United States.

I am not quite sure how we can go forward with major legislation impacting one-sixth of the economy, opposed by every major healthcare organization in the country, and not have one hearing. I am not quite sure how that can be done, but that is precisely what the Republican leadership here is doing.

It is not just BERNIE SANDERS who opposes this legislation. It is the AARP, which is the largest senior group in America. It is the American Medical Association. Hey, those are our doctors. When you get sick, you go

to a doctor. Many of them are members of the American Medical Association. They say this bill is a disaster. It is not just doctors. It is nurses. It is hospital administrators. It is the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, the American Academy of Family Physicians, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Psychiatric Association, the Federation of American Hospitals, the Catholic Health Association, the American Lung Association, the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, the March of Dimes, the National MS Society, and the American Nurses Association, among many other organizations that oppose this bill being written behind closed doors.

Several months ago, as I think everybody knows, with the strong support of President Trump, the House passed their disastrous healthcare bill. Now, we know what is in the House bill. The Senate bill probably is being worked on as we speak, so we don't know what is in that exactly, but let me tell my colleagues what the House bill does. At a time when 28 million Americans today—before the Republican bill—have no health insurance and millions more are underinsured, with high deductibles and copayments, this bill from the House will throw another 23 million Americans off of the health insurance they currently have.

Think about it. Gee, if we have 28 million Americans off of health insurance, what most Americans would say is: OK, how do we lower that number? In fact, the Affordable Care Act added another 20 million people to the ranks of the insured. This bill throws 23 million on top of the 28 million we currently have uninsured, almost doubling the uninsured in America to over 50 million people. Think about it. People have a hard time even beginning to believe that legislation that is being seriously debated would almost double the number of uninsured in America.

Everybody understands—there is no debate about this—that the Affordable Care Act is far, far from perfect. This is a point I have been making from the day the Affordable Care Act was passed. Premiums in my State of Vermont and around this country are too high, deductibles are too high, copayments are too high, and too many Americans remain uninsured or underinsured. But in each and every one of these legitimate concerns, the Republican legislation that has been brought forward and passed in the House would only make a bad situation much worse.

The Republicans say: Oh, the Affordable Care Act is a bad piece of legislation. It has problems. The Affordable Care Act does have problems. Their legislation exacerbates every single one of the problems that it has.

So our job today, and I think what the average American understands—OK, we have problems. What are the problems? We have listened. Deductibles are too high. Copayments are too high. Premiums are too high. Prescription drug prices are way too

high. OK. Let's discuss it. What is your idea? How do we deal with these problems? That is what the American people want. The American people want us to address the problems that are in the Affordable Care Act, not destroy it.

It seems to me clearly that our job right now—and the American people are rising up. They are not going to accept this Republican legislation. Together we are going to defeat it.

I wish to speak for a moment about what it means if this legislation were to pass. What are the implications of throwing 22 million people—that is the Senate bill—off of health insurance, and 23 million people in the House bill? Let me tell my colleagues. I want every American to think about this. Just think about it. Think about somebody today who has cancer and is maybe in chemotherapy or maybe in radiation, somebody who has heart disease, somebody who has diabetes or some other life-threatening disease. There are God knows how many people in this country right now who are sick. What happens if they lose their health insurance? A simple question. You have cancer, you are getting treatment today, and the Republican bill takes away your health insurance. What happens to you when you cannot afford to go to the doctor when you feel a lump in your breast or when you have problems with your heart? What happens to you if you have a heart attack or a stroke and need significant care, but you have no health insurance and you don't have the money to pay for the outrageously high cost of care?

Here is the horrible and unspeakable truth that has to be brought out into the open; that is, if this legislation were to pass, many thousands of our fellow Americans would die, and many more would suffer and become much sicker than they should. Now, I am not suggesting that there is anybody in this body who wants to see anybody die unnecessarily. Nobody does. But people have to take responsibility for their actions, and if you throw 23 million people off of health insurance, many of whom might have life-threatening illnesses, thousands of people will die.

Several weeks ago I was on a television program, and I said just that, and then right after that, I was criticized by Republicans and rightwing critics: Why did you say that? What a terrible thing. Why are you frightening the American people? "Some people will die"—that is not true.

Well, PolitiFact is a nonpartisan organization that checks out what public officials say, and they took a look at well over 10 different studies on the issue of mortality rates and lack of insurance coverage. That is what they studied. They looked at more than 10 different studies looking at mortality rates and lack of healthcare coverage. What PolitiFact concluded is that the point that I made—that many thousands will die—is well supported. It is not BERNIE SANDERS. I am not coming up with some idea off the top of my

head. This is what many, many medical and scientific studies have told us.

Obviously nobody can predict exactly how many people will die if 23 million people lose their health coverage, but what experts at the Harvard School of Public Health estimate is that if 23 million people are thrown off of health insurance, as the House bill does, up to 28,000 people could die each and every year—28,000 people. That is nine times more than the tragic loss of life we suffered on 9/11, and that would take place each and every year. In the wealthiest country in the history of the world, we must not allow that to happen.

This bill would impact the children, many of whom are covered by the CHIP program, covered by Medicaid. You tell me what happens to a kid who has a disability right now and whose family receives Medicaid. Some of those children may have Down syndrome. Some of those children may have cerebral palsy, muscular dystrophy, maybe autism. They may have mental health needs, such as depression or anxiety, or complications from premature birth. Today, Medicaid and CHIP cover 5 million—or 44 percent—of those kids, providing them with coverage so that they can live with dignity and security.

But it is not just the children who will be impacted, it is also the elderly. What every person in America should understand—and many do not—is that Medicaid now pays for over two-thirds of all nursing home care. So I ask my Republican friends: What happens when you slash Medicaid? Who will pay for somebody's mom or dad in a nursing home dealing with Alzheimer's disease? How many seniors in this nursing home will get thrown out on the street or be forced to live in their children's basement? Well, we don't know the answer to that. We haven't had any hearings. We haven't heard any people testify to that. But I think we will see a whole lot of families disrupted, having to make the choice about whether to take care of their parents or provide for their kid to go to college.

It is not just nursing home care. What happens if you are just an older worker. Maybe you are 60 years of age. Well, the likelihood is that if you are a 60-, 62-year-old worker, the cost of your premiums is going to soar. Again, this is not BERNIE SANDERS' view; it is what the AARP says.

This is a quote from the AARP from June 22:

This new Senate bill was crafted in secrecy behind closed doors without a single hearing or open debate—and it shows. The Senate bill would hit millions of Americans with higher costs and result in less coverage for them.

AARP is adamantly opposed to the Age Tax, which will allow insurance companies to charge older Americans five times more for coverage than everyone else while reducing tax credits that help make insurance more affordable.

That is the AARP.

What about the opioid epidemic, which is hitting my State of Vermont hard and hitting States all over this

country? Each and every day, more than 90 people in America die from an opioid overdose. Can you believe that? Ninety people die every single day. Nearly 4,000 people begin abusing prescription painkillers, and about 600 start using heroin. We have a major, major crisis in opioid addiction and heroin overdoses.

It turns out that if you cut Medicaid by \$800 billion, which is what the Republicans are talking about, our ability to address the opioid crisis will be severely curtailed. At a time when we should be expanding prevention efforts, expanding treatment efforts, the Republican bill will make it much harder for us to deal with the opioid crisis.

This legislation is not what the American people want. I understand that the Republican leader today suggested that Members of the Senate may have to stay here for a few more weeks in August, and I can understand that. If I were the Republican leader, I would not want my Senators to go home to hear what the American people have to say about this legislation.

The truth is, poll after poll shows overwhelming opposition to this disastrous legislation. According to the latest USA TODAY/Suffolk University Poll, just 12 percent of the American people support the Republican bill.

As a matter of fact, according to a recent report, this is the most unpopular piece of legislation in the last three decades. It is more unpopular than the \$700 billion bailout of Wall Street. That is pretty unpopular. The American people are catching on as to what is in this bill, and they do not want to see it.

Let me conclude by saying what is as obvious as can be. It is what the American people want. Are there problems with the Affordable Care Act? Absolutely. Premiums are too high, deductibles too high, copayments too high, prescription drug prices are off the charts.

Let's deal with it. What is the problem? Let's deal with it. Put it on the table, and let us address those problems. The American people want to improve the Affordable Care Act, not destroy it.

Let me now, speaking for myself only, say this. I hope very much there can be bipartisan efforts to improve the Affordable Care Act, but I happen to believe we have to go further than that. I intend to help lead that effort.

In my view, there is something profoundly wrong when the United States of America is the only major country on Earth—the only one—that doesn't guarantee healthcare to all people as a right, while at the same time we spend far more per capita on healthcare. We spend far more per capita on prescription drugs, and our healthcare outcomes are not particularly good compared to many other countries.

I think the time is long overdue as to why we do not ask ourselves: How is it Canada can guarantee healthcare to all people, the UK can do it, Germany can do it, France can do, Scandinavia can

do it? Every major country on Earth recognizes that healthcare must be a right, not a privilege.

I happen to agree with that. That is why I will—as soon as this debate is over and as soon as, hopefully, we defeat this disastrous Republican legislation—introduce a Medicare-for-all, single-payer bill, which will in fact guarantee healthcare to all of our people in a cost-effective way.

Let me conclude by saying that the current Republican bill in front of us is a moral outrage. There are very few people in America who think you should throw 22 million of our people off of health insurance in order to give huge tax breaks to billionaires. This is a moral outrage, and it must be defeated. I will do everything in my power to see that it is defeated.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, like many of our colleagues during the Fourth of July break, I spent much of my time crisscrossing the State of Maryland. On the Fourth of July, I attended many parades. The very first parade of that day was in a part of Maryland outside of Baltimore City, called Dundalk, MD, where Donald Trump had done very well in the past election.

What I found during that parade was a lot of people there who were still supportive of President Trump but not one person at that parade who was in favor of TrumpCare or the Senate Republican so-called healthcare bill—not one.

I was listening to the Senator from Vermont about the most recent polling. The polling I had seen previously had shown 17 percent of the American people in favor of this, which was very low. I am not surprised to hear it is even lower now at 12 percent because my own personal experience in these places in Maryland that had been supportive of Donald Trump, and in many ways still are, were that they were not in favor of this healthcare bill. In many ways, they had felt betrayed by it.

After all, during the last campaign, Donald Trump said he wasn't going to cut Medicaid, and yet the bill before us has dramatic cuts to Medicaid. In fact, the Senate bill has even deeper cuts to Medicaid over time than the House bill.

We all remember the House bill. President Trump had a great celebration in the Rose Garden in public, but behind closed doors he called it mean. Yet the Senate bill, when it comes to Medicaid cuts, will make them even deeper over a period of time, according to the report issued by the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, just as we all left town for the Fourth of July break.

It was an interesting experience to hear people, on the one hand, saying let's find ways to work together on

many of the challenges we have in this country—and we should find ways to work together—but are strongly opposed to the healthcare bill that is before the Senate right now. The reason is, they are paying attention. They are concluding about this bill the same thing that the AMA, the American Medical Association, has concluded. In opposing this bill, America's doctors say it violates the No. 1 principle of medicine, which is: First, do no harm. That is the Hippocratic Oath. This Senate so-called healthcare violates that very simple proposition. At the very least, we want a healthcare system that doesn't do greater harm than what would otherwise be flawless. Yet we know, from this legislation, in looking at it, that it does do great harm to our healthcare system in the United States of America.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has looked at it and concluded that if you pass this legislation, 22 million fewer Americans will have access to affordable care than if you don't pass the bill. So it does harm compared to where we are today.

It is absolutely true that the Affordable Care Act is not perfect. In fact, the healthcare exchanges specifically can be improved. We need more choices. We need more competition there. Make no mistake, the Senate Republican bill and the bill that passed the House don't improve the Affordable Care Act. They destroy those parts of it that are working and have been of great benefit to tens of millions of Americans.

The Congressional Budget Office also tells us that premiums will go up next year. The Congressional Budget Office also tells us that if you are a senior between the ages of 50 and 64, you are in for a walloping increase in your premiums, which of course is what the AARP calls the age tax and why they are on the warpath against this legislation—because it will be greatly damaging to those seniors who are in the individual market who are now going to have to pay huge increases in premiums. Those have been documented by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

I would remind my colleagues that the head of the Congressional Budget Office was someone selected by the Republican chairman of the Senate Budget Committee and the Republican chairman of the House Budget Committee, and the CBO is our referee in this place.

If we all could make up our own facts, which in many cases the debates go in those directions anyway, it would be an even more unruly place. At least we have the CBO to provide that analysis. It is not just the CBO. This is masquerading as a healthcare bill.

I ask the question of my colleagues, Why is it that every single patient advocacy group that has weighed in on this bill has weighed in against this bill? These are not Democratic organizations or Republican organizations:

the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, the American Diabetes Association, the National Association on Mental Illness, National Breast Cancer Coalition, the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, the Alzheimer's Association. These are our constituents.

They don't wake up every morning thinking about a Democratic plan or Republican plan or Independent plan. These are organizations dedicated to patient health. They are all against a bill that is parading as a healthcare bill.

How can that be the case, that every single advocacy group that has weighed in on this bill that has a healthcare mandate and is nonpartisan is against it?

I ask my Republican colleagues to go back to the drawing board. This is not a healthcare bill, not when every single patient advocacy group weighed in against it, not when nonpartisan analysis tells us that 22 million people will lose out, not when the American Medical Association says it violates this simple principle of, first, do not harm.

It is not just the doctors. It is the nurses. It is the hospitals. It is the National Rural Health Association. I spent a good amount of time in rural Maryland over the Fourth of July break. Rural hospitals are terrified of the consequences of this legislation, not just because of the harm that will befall their patients because their patients will be denied access to affordable care—but when they no longer have patients who are covered by insurance who come through their doors and there is an emergency so they provide that care anyway, then the hospital all of a sudden is not getting paid for the care it provides. They are deathly afraid they are going to have to scale back their operations and lay off people in a lot of these rural hospitals.

I really hope and believe this is a moment where the Senate can look at this situation and decide let's not go down this road because the American people are asking themselves why are we doing this. It is one of those cases where I think people sort of lost track of why, other than the fact that, as many have said today, there had been this call to get rid of ObamaCare, to get rid of the Affordable Care Act but never a lot of thought as to what was going to replace it.

Now what we are learning is the proposals that would supposedly replace it will do harm. They will do a lot more harm than the place we are at today. Rather than do harm and hurt tens of millions of Americans, let's find a way to improve the current system. There are practical ideas for how we can improve the healthcare exchanges, the marketplaces within the Affordable Care Act. Many of us have put forward ideas, and I would be more than happy to explore with our colleagues ways we can improve upon those exchanges without doing harm.

When you look at this legislation and you realize it is not about healthcare, you have to ask yourself: What is it about other than simply saying we are going to fulfill this pledge of getting rid of the Affordable Care Act? At its core, there are two pillars to this bill. They are rotten pillars, but that is what they are. One is these very dramatic cuts to Medicaid, very dramatic. As I said, the Senate cuts even deeper over a longer period of time than the House bill. In the Senate bill, that cut is around \$770 billion, and then there are also cuts to tax credits that help more Americans afford healthcare. So if you cut Medicaid, you get rid of tax credits that make healthcare more affordable. On the other side of the ledger is this whopping tax cut—a whopping tax cut that goes to some very powerful special interests and some very wealthy individuals. Many of us heard Warren Buffett a couple of weeks ago on TV saying: I don't need a \$670,000-a-year tax cut as part of a bill that is going to put the health of my fellow Americans at risk.

I think a lot of people are asking the question: If this is a healthcare bill, why is the core of it this huge cut to Medicaid and a huge tax break for the wealthiest Americans? And by the way, if you make \$1 million a year, you get a \$57,000-a-year, on average, tax break in this so-called healthcare bill.

So let's put aside a bill that is rotten to its core. I heard a lot of talk about trying to fix this. I would just warn my colleagues to make sure our constituents know that cosmetic changes aren't going to fix this. You can't put a little deodorant on this and make it come out smelling great. It is just not going to happen. But if people are genuinely interested in finding ways to improve the exchanges, I am all in. We certainly should work together to reduce the cost of prescription drugs, and there are lots of proposals out there to do it. The President at one time even talked about making that a priority, but that seems to have fallen away. We all know there are ways we can smartly save money in our healthcare system by continuing to move away from a system that is based simply on the quantity of care and the volume of care and move toward one that rewards the value and quality of care. Let's do that.

The final thing I want to point out is that I was in Southern Maryland over the break, down in a place called St. Mary's County. I visited one of the substance abuse treatment centers called Beacon of Hope Recovery Center. These are people of great faith coming together to help people who are victims of the opioid epidemic, which has had a devastating impact on Maryland, as it has on so much of the rest of the country. We talked about some of the former patients who were there, people who are now actually part of the operation to help save the lives of other people who are racked with addiction. We met with these dedicated staff

members, former patients, and with local law enforcement all around a table, recognizing that if we are really going to conquer the opioid epidemic, we need to provide treatment services. This recovery center was pleading with all of us—with me, asking me to plead with all of our colleagues to not cut Medicaid because they are going to be relying on continuing Medicaid funding in order to provide those treatment services.

I think people around the country are just beginning to learn that Medicaid has been helpful and will become even more helpful in the fight against the opioid epidemic; that it is helping our kids with disabilities and special education in our schools; that it helps low-income working families who may work for an employer who doesn't provide health insurance and who still pays so low that they are at an income level where they qualify for Medicaid. People are also learning that most of the money spent in Medicaid goes to individuals in nursing homes and people with long-term disabilities, people who need long-term care. That is where most of the money goes. And 2 out of 3 dollars spent on nursing home care in the United States are Medicaid dollars.

So we are all in this together. Those deep cuts to Medicaid are going to have a devastating impact, as will the other changes that are going to make health insurance premiums go up for so many people, especially for seniors. And the provisions are going to harm those with preexisting conditions in various ways.

I will end with one of many stories that I have gotten, personal testimonies I received from constituents throughout the State of Maryland.

This one is from Sarah from Arnold, MD, who says:

Without the Affordable Care Act, my family would not have affordable, reliable health insurance. When my 3-year-old was 2 months old, he had emergency brain surgery for a benign cyst. Because of this, and even though he does not have any lingering effects or medical needs as a result of this surgery, we were denied coverage for him before the ACA.

That, of course, is because before the ACA, people could be denied coverage because of a preexisting condition. At the age of 2 months, he had the cyst. He was forever marked as someone with a preexisting condition and therefore could not get affordable coverage.

They wrote:

We were denied coverage before the ACA. In 2014, my husband opened up his own family law practice. Because of this decision, we were on our own for health insurance.

So they bought into the exchange.

And we are now in our second year of excellent coverage thanks to the Affordable Care Act. Having a fixed monthly payment with the options and privileges equal to those who work for big companies has been immensely helpful. The Affordable Care Act has worked for me and my family.

Mr. President, my point is not that the Affordable Care Act is perfect. There are improvements that can be

made. We should work together to make improvements, but let's not do something that violates what the doctors call the Hippocratic Oath. Let's not do something that does more harm in our system. Let's not do something that will result in 22 million fewer of our fellow Americans having access. Let's do something good together that actually builds on what we have, fixes what is broken, because we can make improvements in the Affordable Care Act, not by doing a U-turn and going backward but by looking forward.

Mr. President, I really hope that we will do that together.

Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 12 noon tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:22 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 12, 2017, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

RANDAL QUARLES, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR THE UNEXPIRED TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2004, VICE JEREMY C. STEIN, RESIGNED.

RANDAL QUARLES, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR THE TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

RANDAL QUARLES, OF COLORADO, TO BE VICE CHAIRMAN FOR SUPERVISION OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS. (NEW POSITION)

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

RONALD L. BATORY, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION, VICE SARAH ELIZABETH FEINBERG.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SUSAN COMBS, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, VICE RHEA S. SUH, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

PAUL DABBAR, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR SCIENCE, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, VICE FRANKLIN M. ORR, JR.

MARK WESLEY MENEZES, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF ENERGY, VICE KRISTINA M. JOHNSON, RESIGNED.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

DENNIS SHEA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A DEPUTY UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE (GENEVA OFFICE), WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, VICE MICHAEL W. PUNKE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MARY KIRTLEY WATERS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS), VICE JULIA FRIFIELD.

LEWIS M. EISENBERG, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SAN MARINO.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ROBERT P. KADLEC, OF NEW YORK, TO BE MEDICAL DIRECTOR IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS, AND TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE NICOLE LURIE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

STEPHEN B. KING, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE CZECH REPUBLIC.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE FESTUS HIGH SCHOOL ROCKET CLUB ON THEIR FIRST PLACE WIN REPRESENTING THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTERNATIONAL ROCK-ETRY CHALLENGE IN PARIS, FRANCE

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a group of high school students from my district, the Festus High School Rocket Club on their first place win representing the United States in the International Rocketry Challenge in Paris.

Members of the team include Grace Basler, Ed Bohnert, Cydney Breier, Ryan Brown, Christopher Carden, Ashton Croft, Joel Marler, Rylie Martin, Jacob Rozner, and the club president Timothy Ruesche. They are coached by Devin Lorenz, a former member of the Festus Rocket Club himself.

In May of this year the Festus High School Rocketry Team participated in the annual Team America Rocketry Challenge's (TARC) Final fly-off in The Plains, Virginia. They were awarded first prize over 100 other teams from across the United States, which included a combined \$20,000 in scholarships and a trip to Paris, France to compete in the International Rocketry Competition. At the International Rocketry Challenge, Festus High School, representing the United States, bested competing teams from France, Great Britain, and Japan to take first place.

TARC is the aerospace and defense industry's flagship STEM program that is sponsored by the National Association of Rocketry, the Aerospace Industries Association, and numerous industry partners including Raytheon Company, Boeing Company and Thales USA. Raytheon Company has sponsored Team USA's attendance in the international competition for 12 years and running. In the age of technology, exposure to STEM education and opportunities is a national priority in order to ensure our workforce is equipped for the challenges of the 21st century. TARC has provided more than 65,000 middle school and high school students an opportunity to be engaged in hands-on experience that allows them to develop skills to assist them in future careers in STEM and aerospace.

I ask you to join me in recognizing the Festus High School Rocket Club for their extraordinary accomplishment on behalf of the United States.

HONORING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS DEMARCK WIMBERLY'S TWENTY YEARS OF SERVICE TO HIS COUNTRY AND HIS HONOR-ABLE RETIREMENT FROM THE UNITED STATES ARMY

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Sergeant First Class Demarck Wimberly on his retirement from the United States Army after 20 years of faithful service to our country. An esteemed and respected member of the U.S. Army, Sergeant First Class Wimberly most recently served as a senior operations Non-commissioned officer and trainer for the Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Organization. In this capacity, he was instrumental in the training and preparation of hundreds of personnel from across the Armed Forces as they prepared to deploy to some of the most dangerous places in the world.

SFC Wimberly's distinguished career began with the 4th Squadron 7th Cavalry Regiment, Camp Garry Owen South Korea. Sergeant First Class Demarck Wimberly's duty stations include, Fort Riley Kansas, Fort Hood Texas, Fort Richardson Alaska, Fort Bliss Texas, Fort Carson Colorado, Fort Campbell Kentucky, and finally the Pentagon where he was inducted into The Order of Saint Maurice. During these many duty stations, Sergeant First Class Demarck Wimberly deployed with 2nd Battalion 8th Infantry Regiment (4th Infantry Division) from Fort Hood Texas for the invasion of Iraq in 2003 where he received the Soldier's Medal for heroism, he also deployed with the 172nd Stryker Brigade in 2005 from Fort Richardson Alaska and to Djibouti Africa in 2013 in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

SFC Wimberly's awards and decorations include the Soldier's Medal for heroism, Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation medal (6th award), Joint Service Achievement Medal, Army Achievement Medal (5th Award) as well as numerous unit awards and service medals. Through his distinguished service, SFC Wimberly has also earned the Combat Infantryman Badge and Expert Infantryman badge. SFC Wimberly has also received the Order of Saint Maurice for his significant and long-lasting contributions to the infantry community.

As SFC Demarck Wimberly embarks on a new chapter in life, it is my hope that he may recall, with a deep sense of pride and accomplishment, the outstanding contributions he has made to the United States Army. I would like to send him my best wishes for continued success in his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING UNITED STATES ARMY COLONEL THOMAS TICKNER

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the service of Colonel Thomas Tickner who is coming to the end of his assignment as the Chief of the Congressional Budget Liaison for the Secretary of the Army.

Tom is a native of Wayne, Pennsylvania. He received his Bachelor of Science degree in Civil Engineering from Pennsylvania State University in 1990, his Masters of Civil Engineering Degree from University of Colorado at Boulder in 1999, and a Masters of Science in National Resource Strategy from the Eisenhower School, National Defense University in 2013.

Over the last year, Tom has made significant and lasting contributions while liaising with the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to provide critical resources for Army Warfighters. Tom and his liaison team worked closely with every appropriation office in Congress; ensuring accountability to Congress and our Nation's taxpayers.

Through 26 years of active duty, Tom has served in a variety of tactical, operational, and strategic assignments. In 1989, Tom was commissioned a Distinguished Military Graduate through the Army Reserve Officer Training Corps. He began his military career in the 326th Engineer Battalion, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) followed by an assignment to the 84th Engineer Battalion (Combat Heavy), Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, where he held company command. Following graduate school he served in various assignments with the Sacramento District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from January 2000 to July 2002, to include a deployment to lead the Los Alamos Fire Recovery Office. From June 2003 to May 2005, Tom served as the Operations Officer and Executive Officer for the 52nd Engineer Battalion (Combat Heavy), Fort Carson, Colorado, where he deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. From June 2005 to June 2008 he served as an Engineer Branch Assignment Officer at the Army's Human Resources Command followed by command at the Philadelphia District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from June 2008 to July 2010. Tom worked as the Military Assistant for the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) from July 2010 to July 2012. After graduating from the Dwight D. Eisenhower School for National Security and Resource Strategy, Tom commanded the Savannah District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from July 2013 to June 2015. Most recently, Tom returned from a one-year tour in Afghanistan serving as the Engineer Director for the Combined Security Transition Command—Afghanistan.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, as Colonel Tom Tickner moves on to a new assignment, he leaves behind a legacy of professionalism and friendship. I want to extend my thanks for his service and wish him and his family continued success in his future endeavors.

JROTC TEAMS OF MARINER,
RIVERDALE, AND GULF COAST

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the JROTC teams of Mariner, Riverdale, and Gulf Coast high schools. These teams recently competed in the National All-Services JROTC Academic and Leadership Bowl Competition in Washington D.C. and all three placed in the top fifteen of 64 teams.

For over a century the JROTC program has instilled in students the value of teamwork, citizenship, and public service. This competition tests students in both academics and leadership. To get to the national competition, the three schools competed against a combined 2,600 teams.

It is humbling to see the young men and women of Collier and Lee Counties excel and show their knowledge and passion for civil service. I look forward to seeing what these young scholars will accomplish for our community and our country in the years to come.

FRANK PIPER

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of the late Walter Frank Piper, United States Army Private First Class, of Williamstown in New Jersey's First Congressional District.

Walter Piper, born April 6, 1930, was a proud resident of Williamstown and son of the late Charles and Alice Piper. Walter Piper graduated Glassboro High School in 1949.

Walter Piper enlisted in the U.S. Army in 1950, a year after graduating high school. He was a member of Headquarters Company, 3rd Battalion, 38th Infantry Regiment, 2nd Infantry Division. PFC Piper was taken prisoner of war during the Korean Conflict on February 13, 1951. PFC Piper died June 18, 1951 while being held prisoner of war.

PFC Piper's unidentified remains were recovered in 1990, returned to Hawaii on June 24, 1991, and positively identified April 18, 2017.

Walter Piper's name is inscribed on the Courts of the Missing at the Honolulu Memorial. Private First Class Piper has been posthumously awarded the following: Purple Heart with Oak Leaf cluster, Prisoner of War Medal, Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Korean Service Medal, Combat Infantryman Badge, United Nations Service Medal, Republic of Korea War Service Medal and the Republic of Korea Presidential Unit Citation.

On June 17, 2017, PFC Walter Piper will return home to Williamstown for the first time in 67 years, where he will finally be laid to rest with the full military honors he rightly deserves, at Gloucester County Veterans Memorial Cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, PFC Walter Frank Piper is by all accounts an American hero who selflessly served his country and gave his life for his country. His service, sacrifice, and legacy must never be forgotten. I ask you to join me in honoring the memory of this great American and patriot.

KATE'S LAW

SPEECH OF

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2017

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on June 29th I voted in favor of H.R. 3004, Kate's Law, which increases penalties for deported criminals that return to the United States.

The bill is named after Kate Steinle, who was killed in San Francisco by a Mexican national who had seven felony convictions on his record and had been deported five times and had once again returned to the United States.

I have always argued that we need comprehensive immigration reform to fix our broken immigration system. In 2013, I cosponsored the House Democratic comprehensive immigration reform bill, H.R. 15, the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act. This bill included similar provisions to Kate's Law and had broad bipartisan support in the House and Senate.

Opponents of the bill argue that the bill does not make exceptions for asylum seekers or victims of human trafficking. That is why I voted in favor of a Motion to Recommit H.R. 3004 offered by Representative ZOE LOFGREN which would safeguard vulnerable victims of human trafficking that voluntarily present themselves at a port of entry. Unfortunately, it failed on a 193 to 232 vote.

I have always maintained that undocumented immigrants who commit a crime in the U.S. should be deported. While this bill is not perfect, Kate's Law ensures that dangerous criminals are prosecuted accordingly. I am committed to regaining control of our country's borders and have fought to restrict individuals who would do our citizens harm—both through terrorist attacks, drug smuggling, and other illicit activity—from entering the United States.

H.R. 3004 is not a perfect bill. It now heads to the Senate, where I hope it will be improved to include exceptions for victims of trafficking and those seeking asylum, similar to the comprehensive bill in 2013, and sent back to the House for further debate.

RECOGNIZING NORTHEAST GEORGIA'S SERVICE ACADEMY AP-
POINTEES

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today in recognition of

northeast Georgia's 11 service academy appointees. These outstanding men and women are pursuing the honorable path of military service. At the U.S. service academies, these students will further their education and develop the skills needed to serve our country.

Those who are willing to lay their lives on the line do not make this decision impulsively. Instead, they make a conscious choice to put country before self, a choice that tests their strength and builds their commitment to service.

At a recent reception honoring these young leaders, I told them, "Don't look back. The challenges that lie ahead should not deter you from doing what you have set out to do.

"The challenges that you face will never outweigh the pride that you have in our country and the love that you have for your friends and neighbors."

I thank these men and women for their willingness to serve, and I will keep them in my prayers as they enter a new season at the United States military academies.

HONORING MR. KEN CROWLEY

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ken Crowley for his dedication to our community and service to those in need in Connecticut. In our state, Ken is well known both for his leadership in business and for his willingness to step up to help others.

Ken is a native of Waterbury, Connecticut, and learned the value of hard work at a young age after working on a local farm. He fell in love with driving and working with cars, and Ken eventually began working as a salesman in a dealership. Later, he rose up to run his own dealership. Now, Ken is one of Connecticut's largest and most successful auto dealers, with 13 franchises employing hundreds of people. In addition, Ken has shown great commitment to the environment. He participated in the CT Green Bank Commercial Property Assessed Clean Energy Program to outfit multiple car dealerships with clean energy improvements.

What's more, Ken has used his success and leveraged his business's influence to address important community needs in Connecticut. He worked with former Governor Jody Rell in 2002 to provide for military families during the holidays. Later, in 2008, Crowley Auto Group partnered with the Army Reserve's Employer Partnership Initiative to help veterans transition to the civilian workforce. Ken was also instrumental in the planning of Bristol Technical Education Center and donates vehicles to the school's auto-shop program. Two decades ago, Ken started the Crowley Automotive Golf Tournament to help raise funds for the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation and has raised over \$1 million over 20 years. In fact, Ford Motor Company recently honored Ken for his community spirit, one of only six dealers worldwide to receive this well-deserved recognition.

Mr. Speaker, Ken Crowley has been a business and community leader in Connecticut, and his work to support veterans and those in

need has made our community stronger and more caring. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor him here today.

EDWARD FORTE

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the Honorable Edward Forte, former Mayor of the Borough of Haddon Heights, Camden County, in New Jersey's First Congressional District, on the occasion of his retirement as supervisor from Public Service Enterprise Group (PSE&G).

Mr. Forte is a long-time constituent and resident of Haddon Heights, where he distinguished himself with a commitment to public service as a member of Borough Council, Borough Council President, Mayor, Director of Public Safety for the Borough, a member of the Borough's Zoning Board, and volunteer firefighter and assistant fire chief for the Borough's fire department.

In 1980, Mr. Forte joined PSE&G, where he would ascend through the ranks to become distribution supervisor at the utility company.

During his employment at PSE&G and his simultaneous tenure as Mayor of the Borough of Haddon Heights, Mr. Forte would work to achieve an important personal milestone, earning his Bachelor of Science in Business Administration degree from Thomas Edison State College. Mr. Forte's determination both inspired those across South Jersey, and provided him with the educational tools to serve him in the execution of his professional and public service duties.

During his tenure as Mayor of Haddon Heights, Mr. Forte launched wellness initiatives, including the "Walk! Heights" campaign, in which he walked through his Borough, engaging constituents and encouraged them to join him promoting healthy living and an active lifestyle. Mr. Forte's service also extended to the New Jersey Order Sons of Italy Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, Edward Forte is a model of community and public service, and an example for others who may wish to serve. I invite you to join me in thanking him for his many contributions to the community. And, I respectfully ask you to join me in congratulating Mr. Forte on the occasion of his retirement.

IN RECOGNITION OF MAJOR
JEFFERY A. SIERPIEN

HON. DAVID A. TROTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to highlight the distinguished career of one of my constituents, United States Marine Corps Major Jeffery A. Sierpien.

Enlisting in the Marine Corps in 1997, Major Sierpien has been deployed seven times throughout his career, including multiple deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan.

He has been an unwavering defender of liberty, selflessly putting his life on the line time

and time again so that we may have the privilege to enjoy the freedoms and liberties that make this country the greatest in the world.

Exemplifying the bravery and honor embodied by so many of our nation's servicemen and women, he has received numerous military decorations and awards, including two Iraq Campaign Medals and two Afghanistan Campaign Medals.

Now back in his home state of Michigan, retiring from a career that has moved him not only across the country, but around the globe, I thank him for his dedicated service and wish him the best of luck in everything he does next—from spending time with his beloved family, to teaching his children the art of hunting and fishing, to setting out on his next adventure.

COLONEL G. SCOTT TAYLOR RELINQUISHES COMMAND OF THE
FORT IRWIN ARMY GARRISON

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of U.S. Army Colonel G. Scott Taylor, who will relinquish command of the Fort Irwin Garrison on July 12, 2017. Colonel Taylor is leaving for his next duty assignment as the Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3—Operations for the 8th Army in Camp Humphrey, South Korea.

I've had the pleasure of interacting with Colonel Taylor the past two years, during which time I saw the passion he possesses for his soldiers and his support for the vital training mission of Fort Irwin and the National Training Center. Colonel Taylor was a driving force behind efforts to improve combat readiness and the quality of life for soldiers under his command. His work culminated in \$6.4 million in improvements to barracks on the installation, and his leadership resulted in the repair of essential base infrastructure that was severely damaged by flooding.

In addition to thanking Colonel Taylor for his service at Fort Irwin, I would also like to recognize his outstanding military career. Colonel Taylor is a decorated combat veteran with over 25 years of service, which includes three combat deployments. I wish Colonel Taylor and his family the best of luck as they embark on a new chapter at Camp Humphrey, but they will be sorely missed back home in the California desert.

CELEBRATING THE 30TH ANNUAL
FULTON COUNTY OFFICE FOR
AGING SENIOR PICNIC

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the 30th Annual Fulton County Office for Aging Senior Picnic.

Since its inception in 1987, the Fulton County Office for Aging Senior Picnic has brought our community together to celebrate our senior citizens. The Senior Picnic features food

and entertainment for people of all ages, highlighting the Office's year-round work for Fulton County seniors. As with many of the Office's programs, the Senior Picnic depends on the dedication and tireless efforts of volunteers from our community.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, I want to thank the Fulton County Office for Aging for its vital service to our seniors. The Office provides programs and information to help our seniors in key areas like healthcare, employment, and legal services. We are grateful to the Office for their continuing commitment to our elderly population, and wish them all the best on their 30th Annual Senior Picnic.

ED McBRIDE

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of the late Ed McBride, a United States Navy World War II veteran who proudly served our nation aboard the USS *Martin* and the USS *Athene*.

After his service to our country, Mr. McBride became a self-employed contractor for 45 years and worked at the former New York Shipyard in Camden, New Jersey and Sun Shipyard in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Mr. McBride's commitment to our nation and community continued long after his active duty service in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. McBride was also a life member of the Berlin, New Jersey Veterans of Foreign Wars and a member of American Legion Post 311 in Atco, New Jersey.

Mr. McBride served his community for 22 years as a member of the Camden County Fire Police, was a life member of the Tansboro Fire Company, held the post of civil defense director for the Township of Winslow, and was past president and member of the Berlin, New Jersey Lions Club.

In addition to his volunteer endeavors, Ed McBride enjoyed a number of hobbies and activities including: cabinetry, camping, golfing and fishing.

Mr. Speaker, Ed McBride was an exemplary citizen with a devotion to public service, commitment, and hard work. I invite you to join me in honoring the memory of this great man.

IN HONOR OF COLONEL STEVEN J.
OWENS

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Colonel Steven J. Owens on his retirement from the United States Army after 30 years of service to our country. An esteemed and respected member of the Army Medical Service Corps, Colonel Owens most recently served as the Deputy Director for Reserve Affairs at the Office of the Surgeon General. In this capacity, he was instrumental in driving policy to improve the capability of the Army to recruit and retain high quality providers to care for our Nations

Daughters and Sons. He also played an integral role in strengthening the relationship between Army National Guard and the Army Reserve medical communities.

Colonel Owens distinguished career began with the Virginia Army National Guard in 1987, and included time at Ft. Belvoir, VA; Camp Robinson, VA; Ft. Pickett, VA; Ft. A.P. Hill, VA; Joint Force Headquarters, VA; the National Guard Bureau; Fort Sam Houston, TX; and the Office of the Surgeon General. During this time, he deployed to Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. During his time in Iraq, he served as the I Corps MNCI and USFI liaison to the Iraqi Army Surgeon. In that role, he performed the medical portion of counter-insurgency training for hundreds of America's service members and advised the Iraqi Army Surgeon on methods to increase capabilities to provide care to the Iraqi Soldiers, and to improve recruitment and retention of providers in the Iraqi Army.

As Colonel Owens embarks on a new chapter in life, it is my hope that he may recall, with a deep sense of pride and accomplishment, the outstanding contributions he has made to the Office of the Surgeon General, the Virginia Army National Guard and to the United States Army. I would like to send him my best wishes for continued success in his future endeavors.

HONORING DOROTHA WHITE

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor, Dorothea White, who passed away on Monday, July 3, 2017 in Henry County.

Mrs. White was born in New Lisbon, Ohio on December 27, 1916. After graduating from New Lisbon High School in 1934, she attended Dayton Conservatory of Music where she studied piano, organ, and accordion. She graced others with her talent for music by providing private piano lessons in New Castle, Indiana and played various instruments well into her nineties. In addition to her musical pursuits, Mrs. White helped run a successful dairy farm with her husband in New Castle and was very involved within the community and politics. She had a profound impact on countless Hoosiers, and her life should be an inspiration to all.

Mrs. White was a life member of the New Lisbon Christian Church and Henry County Historical Society, a founding member of the Henry County Saddle Club, a member of the Live & Learn Club, Indiana Jersey Cattle Club, the Brown Road Club, the Lenba Club of Henry County, the P.E.O.—Chapter AD, and the Altruistic Literary Club.

She served as the Council President on the Henry County Council and was a member of the Henry County GOP Club. Her years spent as a dedicated public servant will always be remembered and appreciated by the community.

Mrs. White was predeceased by her husband of 57 years, Robert; her parents; a brother, Delbert (Virginia) Hoover; and a sister, Betty Ann (Donald) Moore. She is survived by her sons, Stephen (Sharon) White and David (Susanne) White; her grandchildren

Bradley (Deena) White, John (Susan) White, Amy (Jim) Byrum, and Christina (David) Whitesell; ten great-grandchildren; and four great-great-grandchildren to whom I give my deepest sympathies.

IN RECOGNITION OF MARCIA BOYLE

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the outstanding leadership of Marcia Boyle, a rare disease advocate who has dedicated the past four decades of her life to helping people impacted by primary immunodeficiency diseases. This mission was not a path Marcia would have chosen herself. Rather, this mission chose her, and she has responded with full vigor to improve life for not only her own son but for countless other people in the United States and world impacted by one of the more than 300 forms of primary immunodeficiency diseases, or PI.

Thankfully, as a result of Marcia's leadership, the world today is a much brighter place for people with PI, though a number of changes remain to be addressed. Marcia first started to become a rare disease advocate when her son John became seriously ill in the late 1970s. John would later be diagnosed with a form of PI and had received the appropriate medical treatment, life-sustaining therapy he continues utilizing today.

Marcia recognized the deep need for people like John and their families and continued to make a difference for the entire community even though her child and family were taken care of. This led to Marcia's founding of the Immune Deficiency Foundation, an operation she ran out of her kitchen. For a dozen years Marcia worked as a full-time volunteer founder and leader of the organization before embarking on another career in leading development positions at Johns Hopkins Medicine.

Over the past several years, Marcia has significantly expanded the scope, staff and programming of the IDF to reach more persons in need. This includes working with the leading clinicians and scientists in the field to publish evidence-based guides for other clinicians, for parents and for patients. She had served on the board of the National Health Council and has been seen as a national and global leader of the patient advocacy or voluntary health community.

Mr. Speaker, I know many in the PI community are saddened by Marcia's retirement later this summer. To say Marcia has done the job well would be an understatement, and she may have a successor but certainly not a replacement. I'm pleased that Marcia will continue her service to IDF as a volunteer and member of the board of trustees, and am confident that she will continue to help lead this community for decades to come.

CLARENCE B. JONES

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Clarence B. Jones, a towering civil rights figure and advocate for equality and justice. On June 6, 2017, family, friends and community members will gather for the renaming of the Palmyra High School Library and dedication of the newly created Dr. Clarence B. Jones Institute for Social Advocacy as a tribute to Dr. Jones.

Dr. Jones was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on January 8, 1931. He attended Palmyra High School in Palmyra, situated in New Jersey's First Congressional District, where he graduated valedictorian of his class in 1949. Dr. Jones' valedictorian speech, entitled "Tomorrow a Better World," called for breaking down racial barriers and marked the beginning of a life that would involve civil rights activism.

After high school, Dr. Jones attended Columbia University, served the United States military during the Korean Conflict, and graduated from Boston University's School of Law.

In 1960, after practicing law for a few years, Dr. Jones became the attorney and trusted advisor to iconic civil rights leader, the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

In 1963, Dr. Jones played a vital role organizing and planning the historic March on Washington, D.C. alongside Dr. King. Dr. Jones also co-authored the "I Have a Dream" speech, regarded as the most notable civil rights address in U.S. history.

Dr. Jones broke racial barriers in corporate America, becoming the first African American partner at a Wall Street banking investment firm.

Dr. Clarence Jones is an honorable American, who has dedicated his life, voice, and actions to civil rights, and has inspired many to stand up for justice.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in saluting Dr. Jones for his service to our nation, his devotion to the civil rights movement and for his ongoing fight for equality in our great nation.

TRIBUTE TO CATHI MILLER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Cathi Miller, a teacher at Central Academy in Des Moines, Iowa. Cathi was recently recognized by PBS as Iowa's 2017 PBS Digital Innovator.

Each year, PBS recognizes an educator from each state and U.S. territory who display a knack for innovation and "outside the box" thinking in their classroom. Cathi is an outstanding example of these principals. She has shown that when a teacher fully invests themselves in their students, the sky is the limit. Thanks to Cathi's exceptional work, students at Central Academy have the tools and skills to succeed, both in the classroom and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent leaders like Cathi in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize

her today for receiving this esteemed recognition. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating her on receiving this award, and in wishing her nothing but continued success.

TRUMP'S VOTER FRAUD COMMISSION IS A FRAUD AND SHOULD BE DISBANDED NOW

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, unable to cope with the brutal fact that he lost the popular vote to Hillary Clinton by 2.9 million votes, the largest vote deficit of any president in American history, Donald Trump tweeted that he would have won the popular vote but for "millions of people who voted illegally."

Instead of producing any credible evidence to support this claim, a hoax that has been repeatedly and decisively debunked by experts, the President doubled down and issued an Executive Order establishing the "Presidential Advisory Commission on Election Integrity" (PACEI), appointing Kris Kobach, anti-immigration warrior and poster-child for voter fraud conspiratorialists everywhere, to lead the Commission.

It would be more accurate to characterize the PACEI as the "Presidential Advisory Commission on Vote Suppression." Voter suppression is real but the oft-repeated claim that American elections are rife with voter fraud is a myth.

According to a comprehensive 2014 study published in *The Washington Post*, out of more than a billion votes cast between 2000 and 2014, only 31 credible instances of impersonation fraud were found, and even this tiny number was likely inflated because the study's author counted not just voter fraud prosecutions or convictions but all credible claims. Numerous other reports have reached the same conclusion.

Any lingering doubt regarding the true purpose of the PACEI should be laid to rest by the request made by Commissioner Kobach on June 28, 2017 when he wrote each of the nation's state secretaries of state requesting that they provide the Commission with "the full first and last names of all registrants, middle names or initials if available, addresses, dates of birth, political party (if recorded in your state), last four digits of social security number if available, voter history (elections voted in) from 2006 onward, active/inactive status, cancelled status, information regarding any felony convictions, information regarding voter registration in another state, information regarding military status, and overseas citizen information."

The information requested by the Commission will not prevent voter fraud. It will violate rather than protect voter privacy.

And it will make it easier to craft legislation and devise campaign strategies intended to suppress the vote in urban clusters and among targeted demographic groups, particularly minority voters.

It is important that all voters, and the people of the 18th Congressional District of Texas whom I am privileged to represent, be fully protected.

While supplying only public voter information may seem secure, the sad fact is that it is not. There is no publicly accessible database of voter registration information in any of the 50 states or the District of Columbia.

That is because information of this kind is protected from public disclosure under the settled principle of 'collective privacy' recognized by the Supreme Court in the landmark decision of *NAACP v. Alabama*, 377 U.S. 288, 84 S. Ct. 1302, 12 L. Ed. 2d 325 (1964), which held that compelled disclosure of affiliation with groups engaged in advocacy may constitute an impermissible chilling effect on the freedom of association guaranteed by the First Amendment, a holding that has been affirmed repeatedly.

Accordingly, neither Texas nor any state can, consistent with the U.S. Constitution, supply the voter information requested by the PACEI.

Indeed, if the information sought was as public in nature as PACEI contends, there simply would be no need for it to request the information from state governments.

Trump's voter suppression commission is a solution in search of a problem.

Contrary to what Trump and Kobach would have the public believe, American elections are not rife with widespread voter fraud. Studies have shown that it is more likely an American "will be struck by lightning than that he will impersonate another voter at the polls."

No, the major ill affecting our election system is not that too many people vote due to voter fraud, but that too many people are prevented from voting due to vote suppression schemes such as discriminatory photo identification requirements, curtailment of early voting, too few polling stations leading to long lines and excessive wait times, and purging of election rolls.

Even in the wholly unimaginable event that the commission created by Donald Trump and led by Kris Kobach could be trusted enough for states to cooperate by sharing their voter data, there is no reasonable basis for assuming that information would be kept secure and the privacy of voters protected.

Recent cyberattacks have made clear the vulnerability of large central databases to cyberattack. An information security breach at the Department of Veterans Affairs compromised sensitive personal data of 26.5 million persons and cost the VA between \$100 million to \$500 million to remediate; another occurring at the Office of Personnel Management impacted 22 million current and former federal employees, many of whom held sensitive security clearances; and the attack on Yahoo, the mother of all security breaches, resulted in 1.5 billion user accounts being compromised.

Because large centralized databases are targets of opportunities for criminals, terrorists, and foreign adversaries, it would be the height of recklessness for Texas or any state to provide the PACEI with personal information of millions of persons via unsecured email to be stored in undersecured databases on undersecured servers.

One of the biggest strengths of the American election system is its decentralized nature.

Aggregating all voter data into one centralized database with questionable security protections makes that data highly vulnerable to a cyberattack that could lead to the personal

information of hundreds of millions of Americans being stolen and misused.

Voter privacy and the integrity of the secret ballot are integral to American democracy. Voter privacy rights should and must be protected.

This is especially true since we know for certain that adversaries like Russia are actively involved in cyberwarfare campaigns to undermine our democracy.

There is no denying that our election system is under assault, but not in the way Trump imagines.

Instead of wasting taxpayer money to fund an investigation into voter fraud, which is as mythical as a unicorn, American democracy would be better served by focusing on and correcting the real problem with our elections—voter suppression and external, illegal, and international interference in our national elections.

I am not opposed to employing reasonable, legitimate, and workable means to safeguard the integrity of our electoral system and to protect the precious right to vote. But Trump's Presidential Advisory Commission on Election Integrity is incapable of doing either and thus should be disbanded and dissolved immediately.

RECOGNIZING THE UPPER PENINSULA CHAMPIONSHIP RODEO

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the Upper Peninsula Championship Rodeo upon the occasion of its 50th Anniversary. We Michiganders are so proud of the rodeo's half-century of world-class entertainment, turnkey production, and commitment to confronting domestic violence.

This tradition began in 1968 to showcase the rich agricultural production and culture of the Upper Peninsula. Originally established as the "Iron River Area Championship Rodeo," the name was changed to "Upper Peninsula Championship Rodeo" when Michigan state Senator Joe Mack introduced a resolution proclaiming Iron River to be the "Rodeo Capital of the Upper Peninsula." To anyone who visits the wonderful city of Iron River, it is immediately clear that the bustling community takes great pride in hosting the only professional rodeo in Michigan.

Throughout its proud history, the Upper Peninsula Championship Rodeo has featured some of the First District's greatest musicians, athletes, and citizens of the last half-century. The rodeo consistently brings folks from across Northern Michigan and the Upper Peninsula together to enjoy a weekend of community, culture, and competition. Moreover, each year, the economic benefits brought to Iron River cannot be understated as thousands of people travel to the region. The Upper Peninsula Championship Rodeo is about more than just competition, it's a charitable event committed to bringing public awareness to the issue of domestic violence. By raising money for local organizations working to better our communities, the rodeo has set a positive example of what can be achieved when a social event becomes a force for good in the community.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Upper Peninsula Championship Rodeo for 50 years of entertainment and community service. Michiganders can take great pride in knowing the First District is home to such a dynamic event and I look forward to enjoying the rodeo's continued success and dedication.

SEAN HAYS

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Senior Chief Petty Officer Sean Hays of the United States Coast Guard on the occasion of his retirement from active duty.

Senior Chief Petty Officer Hays was born and raised in Ocean City, New Jersey, and in 1997, enlisted in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Following the completion of his U.S. Coast Guard training, Sean Hays served the U.S. Coast Guard with distinction, earning promotions, honors and greater responsibilities. Sean Hays would serve as Petty Officer First Class/Second Class, in which his teams coordinated search and rescue missions, conducted narcotics detection, enforced immigration laws, managed fisheries, and enforced federal boating laws on waterways.

The U.S. Coast Guard would promote Sean Hays to the rank of Chief Petty Officer/Petty Officer First Class and ultimately, Senior Chief Petty Officer, the rank he'd earned before and until the time of his retirement.

In his role as Senior Chief Petty Officer, Sean Hays served as officer-in-charge and in command of U.S. Coast Guard Station Philadelphia, managing personnel and resources relative to maritime law enforcement for the Greater Philadelphia Port region.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in thanking Senior Chief Petty Officer Sean Hays for decades of commitment to serving and protecting the United States of America and its interests, and in wishing him well in his retirement.

RECOGNIZING THE GENEROSITY OF NORTHEAST GEORGIA

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the generosity of my friends and neighbors in northeast Georgia.

Fueled by a passion for service, northeast Georgians recently donated 15,000 pounds of food to the Georgia Mountain Food Bank. Everyday citizens made this incredible donation possible, and, in total, they donated a little more than \$25,000 to feed the homeless men and women in their community.

Their giving spirit reminds me of what I love most about my Georgia home: the people. For so many of my neighbors, kindness is second nature. They never hesitate to help each other out in a time of need.

We have a duty to be aware of the needs in our community and to respond with compassion. After all, as long as we're with friends

and neighbors, giving back is really just sharing.

REMEMBERING THE HONORABLE BONNIE PANNELL

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I rise to honor the life of my personal friend and former Sacramento City Councilwoman, Bonnie Pannell. Bonnie passed away on June 27th of this year at the age of 68. I ask my colleagues to join me in tribute to Bonnie's truly remarkable life, which she dedicated to public service and activism within her community.

Bonnie served Sacramento as a member of its City Council for sixteen years, fighting tirelessly on behalf of the communities of Meadowview, Parkway, North Laguna Creek, and Jacinto Creek. I was honored to work alongside Bonnie in providing flood protection, efficient public transportation, and other essential services for our shared constituents. She was incredibly dedicated to the people she represented, and her partnership was invaluable on numerous initiatives, such as extending Sacramento Regional Transit's Light Rail to Cosumnes River College and opening the Valley Hi-North Laguna Library.

Bonnie was the model of what a true public servant should aspire to be. She knew and loved her constituents, she never lost sight of what was best for them, and she was constantly striving to provide her community with the best resources and opportunities available. The entire Sacramento community suffered a blow when Bonnie was diagnosed with primary progressive aphasia, which forced her to step down from office. I can think of no more fitting tribute to her than what the people of Sacramento did to mark Bonnie's retirement—naming a central and beloved community center in her district the Samuel and Bonnie Pannell Meadowview Community Center. This building, the people and families it serves, and the community in which it is located all remind us that we were honored to be in and experience the presence of Bonnie Pannell.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life of the Honorable Bonnie Pannell. I will miss her professionally, and like so many in my beloved hometown of Sacramento, I will miss her personally.

INTRODUCTION OF A HOUSE RESOLUTION DISAPPROVING OF UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE INSCRIPTION OF HEBRON AS A PALESTINIAN WORLD HERITAGE SITE IN DANGER

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a House Resolution disapproving of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO's) World Heritage Committee Inscription of the ancient city

of Hebron as a Palestinian World Heritage Site in Danger. A UNESCO resolution inscribing Hebron was approved at the end of last week, and is the latest in a regrettable trend at the United Nations (UN). Truly, it seems as if every time I turn around the UN or one of its agencies is pursuing a radical anti-Israel agenda.

In recognizing Hebron as a Palestinian World Heritage Site, UNESCO has once again attempted to rewrite Jewish history out of world history. In the past year, the UN has adopted resolutions that have omitted Jewish identity from the Temple Mount, named for the location of the Jewish Temple two thousand years ago, and also chastised Israel for planting 'fake Jewish graves' in the vicinity. This is ridiculous and bordering on anti-Semitism.

The resolution on Hebron is no different. At the center of Ancient Hebron lays the Cave of the Patriarchs, a shrine that is holy to Jews, Christians, and Muslims, and recognized as the burial place of the Patriarchs and Matriarchs of the Jewish people, Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Rebecca, Jacob, and Leah. It is the second most holy site in Judaism, behind only the Dome of the Rock on the Temple Mount, where the ancient Jewish Temple stood more than two thousand years ago.

The Cave of the Patriarchs sits within a compound constructed by Herod, an ancient King of Judea during the Second Temple Period, when it served as a place for Jewish prayers at the grave sites of the Patriarchs and Matriarchs of Judaism. When the city of Hebron was conquered 700 years ago by the Mamluks, the compound was converted into a mosque and Jews were prohibited from entering. Thus was the case for nearly 700 years, until the city of Hebron was liberated by Israeli forces during the Six-Day War in 1967 and re-established as a place where all religions could worship.

This history is important, Mr. Speaker, because UNESCO's World Heritage Committee does not appear to care about it. But I do. We do. All of us in this body understand the importance of world heritage. The UN does itself a great disservice when it allows these revisionist measures to move forward.

Even as wars and humanitarian disasters rage across the globe, the UN remains relentless in its anti-Israel agenda. I therefore felt it necessary to introduce this resolution today disapproving of UNESCO's inscription of Hebron and its Cave of the Patriarchs as a Palestinian World Heritage Site in Danger, and calling on this body to reject any anti-Israel measure that may follow. I ask that it be given immediate consideration.

WILLIAM "BILL" C. PACKER III

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of William "Bill" C. Packer III who passed away April 16, 2017. He was a husband, father, community leader and dedicated public servant.

Raised in Brooklawn, New Jersey, Bill was the oldest of six children. He graduated from Gloucester City High School and continued his education at Camden County Vocational and

Technical School in Industrial Chemistry, as well as Rutgers University where he studied Advanced Wastewater Treatment. He later earned numerous licenses for water and sewer system operations.

Bill's extensive career started in 1964, as the Superintendent of the Water and Sewer Department for the borough of Brooklawn. He moved to several boroughs in the surrounding areas including: City of Gloucester, Borough of Buena, Borough of National Park and the Borough of Wenonah. Bill also was an instructor at Camden County Technical School and taught at Rutgers University.

Bill Packer is also an American hero, having served in the New Jersey National Guard from 1965 through 1967.

Bill would continue to serve his community in various positions—as Mayor of Westville from 1997 to 2006, as councilman from 2011 to 2014, as Assistant Fire Chief, Chairman of the Board of Fire Commissioners for the Westville Fire District, President of Region VI of the New Jersey Public Works Association, member of the Board of Trustees for the New Jersey Water Association, president and member of the Westville Lions Club, the Gloucester County Mayor's Association, and the Gloucester County College Board of Trustees.

Mr. Packer alongside his wife of fifty years raised a family of six children. He enjoyed playing the xylophone for the Broomall String Band, serving as umpire and coach for his children's baseball and soccer leagues. His ultimate joy was creating memories with his family.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. William "Bill" C. Packer exemplified exceptional dedication to public service and volunteerism. I ask you to join me in honoring the memory of this great American.

IN HONOR OF MR. PAUL
VOERTMAN

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Paul Voertman, the former owner of the iconic Voertman's Bookstore on Fry Street in Denton, Texas. In addition to his business interests, Mr. Voertman also was a patron of the arts, a humanitarian, and a philanthropist.

Mr. Voertman grew up near the University of North Texas and attended the UNT Demonstration School from kindergarten through twelfth grade. He received his undergraduate degree in economics at the University of Texas at Austin. Upon graduation, he entered the U.S. Air Force. While on active duty in Germany, his father passed away and he returned to Denton to take over his father's general store. Over time, Voertman transformed the store into a well-known cultural landmark renowned for its high-quality wares, reasonable prices, and excellent customer service. Countless students at UNT and Texas Woman's University purchased their textbooks, spiral wear, and more at Voertman's.

Mr. Voertman generously contributed to the arts for more than 60 years and was one of UNT's most generous benefactors. In Denton, he sponsored prizes for Texas art organizations, commissioned locally-produced art

works, and established juried art competitions at UNT and TWU, which still continue today. The Voertman-Ardoin Memorial Scholarship assists first-generation college students at UNT, and the Ardoin-Voertman Endowment Fund supports the College of Visual Arts and Design, the College of Music, and the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences.

Mr. Voertman also gave significant financial backing to TWU's Chancellor's Circle, scholarships, and athletics. He was a patron of community organizations, including the Cumberland Presbyterian Children's Home, the Monsignor King Homeless Outreach Center, and the Denton Community Health Clinic.

I would like to express my sincere condolences to Mr. Voertman's family and friends. He will be remembered for his business acumen, cultural contributions, and selfless generosity to the Denton community.

FRIENDSHIP MISSIONARY BAPTIST
CHURCH 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Friendship Missionary Baptist Church on 100 years of service and dedication to the Indianapolis community. As we celebrate its centennial on July 9, 2017, I extend my gratitude to Pastor Ronald Covington and First Lady Kim Covington for their leadership of this community.

Friendship Missionary Baptist Church first opened its doors on the west side of Indianapolis in 1917, under the leadership of Reverend B.T. Westbrook. Since then, Friendship Missionary Baptist Church has gone above and beyond to enrich our community through its youth programs and extensive charitable work, including the redevelopment of the Friendship Westside Center for Excellence.

Mr. Speaker, I would once again like to congratulate Friendship Missionary Baptist Church on their 100th anniversary. I am proud to know that organizations such as Friendship Missionary are flourishing and strengthening our community.

CONGRATULATING SING TAO
NEWSPAPERS

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to congratulate Sing Tao Newspapers on 52 years of providing extraordinary news coverage from its New York branch office.

As one of the oldest and most widely read news sources in the Chinese community, Sing Tao Daily was first published in 1938. Providing in-depth reporting and updates from all corners of the world, Sing Tao Daily allows Chinese citizens living abroad to remain connected with global, national and local coverage. For a number of Chinese residents of my district in the Lower East Side of New York City, Sing Tao Daily serves as that connection.

Through engagement in local communities, the paper is always working to give back by supporting local arts and cultural events.

I congratulate Sing Tao Newspapers for a long history of publishing first-class news coverage. I wish all the staff and journalists many more successful years to come.

MAE KRIER

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a staunch supporter of U.S. efforts during the Second World War, Ms. Mae Krier of Levittown, Bucks County, Pennsylvania, across the river from my Congressional District in Southern New Jersey.

After the attack on Pearl Harbor, when American men were forced to leave their jobs for the battlefield, Mae Krier, who was 17 years old at the time, courageously left home herself, and joined other women to work in factories that supported the U.S. military during time of conflict.

Mae, her sister, and a friend worked at a Boeing plant in Seattle, where 17,000 B-17s and B-29s were built between 1942 and 1945.

Mae is quoted as saying about her service to the U.S., "Hitler thought American women were soft and that we could not produce because we were more concerned about shopping and keeping the house. We showed him what American women are really made of."

Since the 1980s, Mae Krier has stood as a symbol of women's strength and resolve, dispelling notions that strength and bravery are traits exclusive to men.

I ask you to join me in saluting and thanking Mae Krier for her contributions to our country during the Second World War and her selflessness to provide for our country in a time of need.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding a missed vote due to a meeting with a constituent. Had I been present for Roll Call vote No. 341, on H. Res. 3003 on Ordering the Previous Question, I would have voted Yea.

RECOGNIZING PAUL LARKIN'S
90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. DARIN LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor Paul Larkin as he celebrates his 90th birthday on July 4, 1927.

A native of Bloomington, Illinois, Paul enlisted in the Illinois National Guard following his graduation from Normal Community High

School. He was then transferred to the U.S. Army, where he served as a Staff Sergeant in the U.S. Army Signal Corp. during the Korean War. Staff Sergeant Larkin, a bronze star recipient, separated from the service after the signing of the armistice in 1953. Upon his return home, Paul raised his four children alongside his wife, Helen, and managed the family's 160 acre farm.

Following his decorated military career, Paul continues to serve others by volunteering in the Normal, Illinois community. As a man of faith, he served on the Epiphany Catholic Church's first school board. He also is an active member of The Knights of Columbus. At age 90, Paul still resides on the family farm and enjoys spending time with his twelve grandchildren and twenty-two grandchildren.

Paul Larkin has dutifully served his nation and continues to proudly serve his family and community. I thank Paul for his service, and I hope he has a happy birthday.

HONORING TERESA REYNOSO DE GONZALEZ

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a special person in my district, Teresa Reynoso de Gonzalez.

Mrs. Reynoso de Gonzalez and her family have contributed enormously to our community through their efforts in founding and expanding the Northgate Gonzalez markets in California. This month, Mrs. Reynoso de Gonzalez celebrates her 90th birthday.

Mrs. Reynoso de Gonzalez was born in Jalostotitlan, Jalisco Mexico on July 2, 1927 and emigrated to the United States in 1976, where she has served as a loving figure and role model to our community as the co-owner of Northgate Market.

Her leadership of Northgate Market has allowed her family to serve the larger Latino population of Southern California, providing affordable and quality foods and services at over thirty locations and offering a taste of home for the many families that visit Northgate Market with Latino products, culture, and language.

Mrs. Reynoso de Gonzalez and her family's philanthropic efforts extend even further through the Gonzalez Reynoso Family Foundation, which supports neighborhood schools, sports teams, and other events. They have also been instrumental in uplifting the hard-working immigrant community and fostering invaluable memories, such as organizing Christmas gifts for children and hosting reunion meals for local families.

I want to thank Mrs. Reynoso de Gonzalez for the love she has offered so freely. Today, I join my district in recognizing the impact Mrs. Reynoso de Gonzalez has made on the lives she has touched, and wish her a very happy and blessed 90th birthday.

ALFRED C. ASHLEY III

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Fire Captain Alfred C. Ashley III on the occasion of his retirement from the Camden Fire Department in New Jersey's First Congressional District.

Captain Ashley was born and raised in Camden, New Jersey. In 1984, he graduated from Camden Catholic High School. In 1987, he joined the Camden Fire Department.

Following the completion of his training at the fire academy, he had many assignments. Arguably, his favorite assignment was Engine 7 on Kaighn Avenue in the City of Camden. After years of hard work and dedication, he earned the promotion of Fire Captain in April 2001.

Captain Ashley was also a vital part of the Camden Fire Officers Union—IAFF Local 2578. In 2009 he was elected Union President, during which he supported negotiations to fair contracts and maintaining workplace safety for members of the Camden Fire Officers Union.

Captain Ashley's last assignment before his retirement was Ladder Company 2-2 Platoon. After 29 years of service, Captain Ashley retired from the Camden Fire Department on December 31, 2016.

He has one daughter, Zakia, who is his pride and joy. He looks forward to spending more time with her, riding motorcycles and cooking for family and friends.

I ask you to join me in thanking Captain Alfred C. Ashley III for his service to the City of Camden's Fire Department and for his dedication to the people he helped each and every day at work and throughout his career.

IN HONOR OF MICHAEL "MATT"
PATRICK RYAN

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the life and faith of my friend and local Houston radio favorite, Michael "Matt" Patrick Ryan.

Convinced at a young age that he was called to a life in the radio industry, Matt Patrick began his career by spinning records at a small New York radio station. After hosting radio programs in New York, Indiana, and Ohio, his career finally brought him to the great state of Texas in 2011.

Matt quickly became a favorite among his listeners with his no-nonsense way of informing and entertaining his audiences. A well-known name in Houston, Matt anchored the morning news on KTRH and hosted the syndicated Matt Patrick Show every afternoon on KPRC. For his talents in the "theatre of the mind," Matt received national recognition as a two-time Radio and Television Broadcasters Hall of Fame inductee.

In addition to his nearly 40-year career in radio, Matt was often a contributor on Fox 26 Houston, where he discussed politics and de-

bated current events with local activists and public officials.

Matt's straight talking attitude and strong conservative values guided him through his broadcasting career and defined him as an individual. Never shying away from fighting for his beliefs, Matt's passion and dedication to defending the constitution inspired countless listeners, known as Patrick's Patriots.

In September of 2015, Matt faced a new challenge: he was diagnosed with stage IV Melanoma. True to his no-nonsense nature, Matt decided to share his struggle with his listeners, and on July 5th, his six year anniversary at KTRH, he announced that he had exhausted all standard of treatment options.

Following his announcement, his co-workers and radio listeners from across Texas joined together in an outpouring of support that Matt called "breath-taking and humbling."

Constantly supported by his best friend and wife, Paula; his children, Lexa, Alanna, and Jake; his sisters, Maureen Shell and Colleen Ryan Neubauer; his parents, John and Marie Drummond; his father-in-law and mother-in-law, John and Cindy Parker; and his sister-in-law, Dawn Parker; Matt's unwavering moral compass and complete faith in God served as an example to his friends, his community, and his listeners.

It is my honor to join Matt's family, friends, and listeners to recognize his lifetime of service and his steadfast faith. On Sunday, July 9, Matt's battle with cancer ended. Matt's life was an inspiration to all who heard him, and he will be sorely missed.

CELEBRATING THE OPENING OF
THE STORE AT REBUILDING TO-
GETHER SARATOGA COUNTY

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the opening of The Store at Rebuilding Together Saratoga County.

Founded in 2003 by the Larkin Family of Saratoga Springs, Rebuilding Together Saratoga County is an inspiring example of our community coming together to support its members in need. The organization works with low-income homeowners to provide necessary home repairs and safety updates at no cost to the homeowner. Due in large part to their dedicated team of local volunteers, Rebuilding Together Saratoga County continues to strengthen our community by ensuring that our citizens can live safely and independently in their homes.

The opening of The Store is an important development for Rebuilding Together Saratoga County. The revenue from its sales will directly contribute to the organization's projects and operations, allowing them to reach even more people in need.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, I want to thank Rebuilding Together Saratoga County for their incredible service. We are grateful for their commitment to bringing our community together, and wish them all the best on the opening of The Store.

RECOGNIZING CARLY WINTERS

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Carly Winters, one of my Hall County neighbors and a high school basketball player. Carly was recently selected for a spot on the USA Student Athlete World Games Tour, where she will be representing the U.S. as part of the women's basketball team.

Carly has played basketball as part of the East Hall Varsity team since she was a freshman. Last year, her team selected her to lead them as team captain.

We can all look up to Carly because she doesn't confine her diligence to the court. Instead, her diligence extends to her studies and relationships.

Carly is an honors student who routinely invests in others. People say that she is the type of person others want to see succeed.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to highlight this young woman's achievement, and I look forward to seeing what more she will accomplish, both on the court and in her other endeavors.

JOSE BRACERO**HON. DONALD NORCROSS**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor United States Army and New Jersey National Guard veteran, Mr. Jose Bracero of Camden in New Jersey's First Congressional District.

Mr. Bracero was born in Brooklyn, New York, and raised in Camden. In 1999 he graduated from Camden County Technical School. He then joined the U.S. Army in 2001 and was stationed at Fort Drum, 10th Mountain Division, assigned to 1/32 Infantry Regiment Unit.

Jose Bracero's assignments included a six month peace keeping mission in Kosovo from 2001 to 2002, and a one year deployment to Iraq from 2003 to 2004. After he was honorably discharged from the Army, Jose Bracero served four years in the New Jersey National Guard.

Even after his formal service to the United States military ended, Mr. Bracero's contributions to our country continue. In 2010, Jose Bracero started working on behalf work as an outreach coordinator with New Jersey's homeless veteran population as a mission to serve veterans continued in his case manager for Projects for Assistance in Transition. In 2012, Jose Bracero's Soldier On, a private non-profit organization committed to ending veteran homelessness.

Additionally, Mr. Bracero serves as a liaison to multiple non-profits, faith-based organizations, and local police departments to improve the quality of life for Southern New Jersey veterans with housing needs. He can often be found at train stations, airports, soup kitchens and shelters, working to connect veterans to housing opportunities.

Jose Bracero is an honorable American, having served our great nation in a time of war, and merits our collective appreciation.

I ask you to join me in saluting and thanking Jose Bracero for his service to our country and his ongoing commitment to our nation's veterans.

HONORING NAVY REAR ADMIRAL VINCENT L. GRIFFITH IN CELEBRATION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. DONALD S. BEYER, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the career of Navy Rear Admiral Vincent L. Griffith, in commemoration of his retirement.

Admiral Griffith has a lifetime of leadership and commitment within the United States Navy. Prior to assuming his position as director of the Defense Logistics Agency Logistics Operations, he served as commander for the Naval Supply Systems Command Global Logistics Support. He has served several sea tours, including on a submarine, the USS *Stonewall Jackson*, and two aircraft carriers, the USS *Saratoga* and USS *John C. Stennis*. All of these assignments are only a small glimpse at a long career of dedicated service.

Admiral Griffith graduated with a bachelor's degree in business administration from Berry College in 1981. He was commissioned in 1982 through Officer Candidate School as an ensign in the Navy Supply Corps. He received a master of business administration degree from the George Washington University and completed Emory University's Goizueta Graduate School of Management's Advanced Executive Business Program and the Navy Corporate Business Course at University of Virginia, Darden School of Business. His personal awards include the Defense Superior Service Medal, three Legions of Merit, the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, three Meritorious Service Medals, five Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medals, the Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, and the Expert Rifle and Pistol Medal.

I am honored to congratulate Admiral Griffith on his long and successful career. I thank him for the many lives that he has touched along the way. It is for these reasons that I join Admiral Griffith's family and friends in wishing him a blessed retirement and continued health and happiness in the years to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 130TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WORLD'S OLDEST RODEO

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commemorate the 130th Anniversary of The World's Oldest Rodeo, Arizona's own Prescott Rodeo. On 4th of July weekend, cowboys and spectators gathered as they have every 4th of July weekend since 1888 to practice an art as old as raising cattle itself.

Few sports can compete with rodeo as a test of reflex, skill and practical ability. Tracing its origins to the Spanish vaquero, rodeo in

America grew from an Arizona-based cowboy competition into a multimillion-dollar enterprise with hundreds of competitors. Participants harness the spirit of ranchers in the American West, combining raw athleticism with instinctive knowledge and frontier toughness.

This incredible event draws nearly 27,000 people per year and allows Prescott Frontier Days, the event's organizer, to donate thousands of dollars per year to several highly-regarded charities. Their dedicated organization of committed volunteers is one of only sixteen ever to have been inducted into the Pro Rodeo Hall of Fame.

This storied event reflects so many of the values that make the American West, and the American spirit more broadly, unique and important. As we reflect on the 241st celebration of our nation's independence, I am proud to applaud the great Americans of the Prescott Rodeo and the tenacious character they embody.

HONORING FIRST LIEUTENANT JOHN J. DALY

HON. TOM RICE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of our nation's heroes, First Lieutenant John J. Daly. Lieutenant Daly was an All-American in the 82nd Airborne Division during World War II and commanded a parachute company in the 508th Parachute Infantry Regiment.

On June 6, 1944 Lieutenant Daly and his comrades landed behind enemy lines in Normandy, France, and secured multiple bridges of supply for the German beachfront embankment.

One month later on July 4, 1944, Lieutenant Daly gave his life attempting to take Hill 95 in Normandy. The sacrifice of Lieutenant Daly and so many others helped make our country what it is today. Because of their sacrifice, we are an independent nation that remains the strongest beacon of freedom, hope, and prosperity in the world.

We owe a great debt to these members of the Greatest Generation and honor their sacrifice, for without which life as we know it would not exist. May God bless the fallen soldiers, veterans, and those who currently serve, and May God bless the United States of America.

ALEX HORANZY**HON. DONALD NORCROSS**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor United States Army Veteran, Mr. Alex Horanzy of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, just across the Delaware River from my Congressional District in Southern New Jersey.

Mr. Horanzy was born April 22, 1922. He grew up with six other siblings in the Manayunk neighborhood of Philadelphia. On July 13, 1939, at age 17 and with his father's permission, he enlisted in the U.S. Army.

After completing basic training with the 66th Infantry Fort Meade, Maryland, Private Horanzy requested to be shipped overseas; he would be stationed in Oahu, Hawaii where he was assigned to the 19th Infantry at Schofield Barracks, later known as the 24th Infantry Division.

On the morning of December 7, 1941, Mr. Horanzy was jolted awake by the attack on Pearl Harbor. Mr. Horanzy not only survived the Pearl Harbor attack, but his unit courageously fought back and protected our nation in time of conflict. Mr. Horanzy is one of only 88 survivors of Pearl Harbor and the only survivor from the Greater Philadelphia region.

Mr. Horanzy's military service would take him to Australia for intensive training in jungle fighting, and to New Guinea, where he contracted malaria. Mr. Horanzy was honorably discharged from the U.S. military in 1945.

After his military service, Mr. Horanzy attended commercial art school, worked for the Department of the Army, passed his GED test, entered a 4-year apprenticeship for machinists and toolmakers, and worked his way up to a qualified assurance specialist for the Defense Department before his retirement.

He married and had three children.

Alex Horanzy is an honorable American, having served our great nation in a time of war, and merits our collective appreciation.

Alex Horanzy is the living embodiment of the Greatest Generation. I ask you to join me in saluting and thanking Alex Horanzy for his service to our country.

IN MEMORY OF CORPORAL FRANK SANDOVAL

HON. JOAQUIN CASTRO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Corporal Frank Sandoval, a Korean War veteran who was laid to rest at Fort Sam Houston National Cemetery in San Antonio today.

Corporal Sandoval was taken as a prisoner of war and died in a North Korean POW camp when he was just 20 years old. His family was notified that he was missing in 1951, and told of his death in 1953. Sadly, at the time, Corporal Sandoval's remains were misidentified and interred at the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific in Hawaii.

Thankfully, through DNA analysis, the Department of Defense was recently able to correctly identify Corporal Sandoval's body, and he has returned home to San Antonio after more than 60 years.

That Corporal Sandoval will now permanently rest in San Antonio provides his family with long-awaited closure. His sons, Alex and Frank, who were just babies when their father left to serve the United States overseas, have finally had the opportunity to welcome him home. I join the San Antonio community in wishing the Sandoval family well and honoring the return of a patriot who made the ultimate sacrifice for our nation.

COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF HARTZELL PROPELLER

HON. WARREN DAVIDSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize and celebrate the 100th anniversary of Hartzell Propeller. Hartzell Propeller has been a tremendous leader in aviation engineering since its founding in 1917 and it represents the best of American innovation and entrepreneurship. Robert Hartzell founded the company when Orville Wright suggested he use his wood processing plant to manufacture propellers for him and his brother. Since then, the company has developed composite and aluminum propellers for the general aviation market that have broken numerous records and received many awards.

Hartzell Propeller has provided propellers in both world wars and successfully transitioned into the general aviation market because of its commitment to build the highest quality propellers. The phrase "Built on Honor" is placed on the company's propellers to reflect their dedication to this mission. Hartzell Propeller has had a profound impact on the history of American aviation and on its local community in Piqua, Ohio and it will continue to do so for years to come. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in celebrating the 100th anniversary of Hartzell Propeller.

RECOGNIZING CHARLEY PRIDE, WORLD RENOWN COUNTRY MUSICIAN

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize country

music singer, guitarist, performer, and business owner, Charley Pride. Mr. Pride was inducted into the Country Music Hall of Fame in 2000 and is one of only three African Americans to have been inducted as a member of the Grand Ole Opry. His rise to stardom was an amazing feat given his humble beginnings and the obstacles he faced. Nonetheless, he developed a passion for music that could not be satiated. At the tender age of fourteen he purchased his first guitar, taught himself to play by listening to country music on the radio, and the rest is history.

Throughout his musical career, Charley Pride has accomplished what other artists can only dream of: 36 #1 singles, 12 gold albums, 52 top-10 country hits, millions of records sold worldwide, three Country Music Awards, one Grammy Award, and becoming the first major Black country music star.

A man of many talents, Pride also played for the Negro American League's Memphis Red Sox and the East Helena Smelterites before being signed by RCA Records in 1966. The sacrifices he made in order to craft masterpieces such as "Just Between You and Me", "The Snakes Crawl At Night", and "Kiss an Angel Good Mornin'" will forever pale in comparison to the sacrifice he made by putting his musical and professional baseball careers on hold to serve our country.

Despite his undeniable musical talents, Pride faced innumerable obstacles as he—a black man in a field predominantly occupied by whites—pursued a career as a country musician. Despite the heartaches and the challenges, Charley Pride has become one of the most successful artists in the history of country music. From being born in Sledge, Mississippi to a sharecropper, to becoming a special investor and a minority owner of the Texas Rangers, he has lived a life that his parents could not have fathomed. Times have changed, but the love of his three children and his wife, Rozene, have remained consistent.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call this man my constituent. I congratulate and thank him for his role as a trailblazer in music and an inspiration for so many. Mr. Speaker, the work and life of Charley Pride are worth placing these sentiments in the permanent RECORD of the United States Congress.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3889–S3931

Measures Introduced: Seven bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1524–1530, and S. Res. 217–218. **Page S3920**

Measures Reported:

S. 696, to amend title 5, United States Code, to appropriately limit the authority to award bonuses to Federal employees, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 115–127)

S. 829, to reauthorize the Assistance to Firefighters Grants program, the Fire Prevention and Safety Grants program, and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant program, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 115–128)

S. 1099, to provide for the identification and prevention of improper payments and the identification of strategic sourcing opportunities by reviewing and analyzing the use of Federal agency charge cards. (S. Rept. No. 115–129) **Page S3920**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order that amends Executive Order 13761 of January 13, 2017; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–12) **Page S3917**

Nye Nomination—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the nomination of David C. Nye, of Idaho, to be United States District Judge for the District of Idaho. **Pages S3889–S3911**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination, with all post-cloture time being expired, at approximately 12 noon on Wednesday, July 12, 2017; and that if cloture is invoked on the nomination of William Francis Hagerty IV, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador to Japan, the time count as if cloture was invoked at 1 a.m., on Wednesday, July 12, 2017. **Page S3926**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2004.

Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the term of fourteen years from February 1, 2018.

Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be Vice Chairman for Supervision of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years.

Ronald L. Batory, of New Jersey, to be Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration.

Susan Combs, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Paul Dabbar, of New York, to be Under Secretary for Science, Department of Energy.

Mark Wesley Menezes, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Energy.

Dennis Shea, of Virginia, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Geneva Office), with the rank of Ambassador.

Mary Kirtley Waters, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs).

Lewis M. Eisenberg, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Italian Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of San Marino.

Robert P. Kadlec, of New York, to be Medical Director in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, and to be Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, Department of Health and Human Services.

Stephen B. King, of Wisconsin, to be Ambassador to the Czech Republic. **Page S3931**

Messages from the House: **Page S3917**

Executive Communications: **Pages S3917–20**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S3920**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S3920–22**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S3922–24**

Additional Statements: Pages S3914–17
Amendments Submitted: Pages S3924–25
Authorities for Committees to Meet: Pages S3925–26
Privileges of the Floor: Page S3296

Adjournment: Senate convened at 2:15 p.m. and adjourned at 7:22 p.m., until 12 p.m. on Wednesday, July 12, 2017. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3926.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATION

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Richard V. Spencer, of Wyoming, to be Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense, after the nominee, who was introduced by former Senator John Warner, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of David Steele Bohigian, of Missouri, to be Executive Vice President of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, Ray Washburne, of Texas, to be President of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, who was introduced by Senator Cornyn, and Kelley Eckels Currie, of Georgia, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, and to be Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador, and Jay Patrick Murray, of Virginia, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during his tenure of service as Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, both of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Claire M. Grady, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary for Management, Department of

Homeland Security, and Henry Kerner, of California, to be Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of David James Glawe, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, and David P. Pekoske, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary, both of the Department of Homeland Security, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

CONCURRENT CONGRESSIONAL AND CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism concluded a hearing to examine concurrent Congressional and criminal investigations, focusing on lessons from history, after receiving testimony from Richard Ben-Veniste, Washington, D.C., and Andrew L. Frey, New York, New York, both of Mayer Brown LLP; Danielle Brian, Project On Government Oversight, Washington, D.C.; and Charles Tiefer, University of Baltimore School of Law, Baltimore, Maryland.

VETERANS AFFAIRS LEGISLATION

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 115, to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for an operation on a live donor for purposes of conducting a transplant procedure for a veteran, S. 426, to increase educational assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs for education and training of physician assistants of the Department, to establish pay grades and require competitive pay for physician assistants of the Department, S. 683, to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the requirement to provide nursing home care to certain veterans with service-connected disabilities, S. 833, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand health care and benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs for military sexual trauma, S. 946, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire additional Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists to provide treatment court services to justice-involved veterans, S. 1153, to prohibit or suspend certain health care providers from providing non-Department of Veterans Affairs health care services to veterans, S. 1261, to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay the reasonable costs of urgent care provided to certain veterans, to establish cost-sharing amounts for veterans receiving care at an emergency room of the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 1266, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with nonprofit

organizations to investigate medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 1279, to amend title 38, United States Code, to furnish health care from the Department of Veterans Affairs through the use of non-Department health care providers, S. 1325, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the authorities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire, recruit, and train employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and an original bill entitled, “The Department of Veterans Affairs Quality Employment Act of 2017”, after receiving testimony from Baligh R. Yehia, Deputy Under Secretary for Health for Community Care, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and Louis J. Celli, Jr., The American Legion, Amy

Webb, AMVETS, Adrian Atizado, Disabled American Veterans, and Gabriel Stultz, Paralyzed Veterans of America, all of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to consider pending intelligence matters.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 13 public bills, H.R. 3175–3187; 3 private bills, H.R. 3188–3190; and 5 resolutions, H. Res. 432–436, were introduced. **Pages H5432–33**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H5433–35**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2430, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs, medical devices, generic drugs, and biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–201);

H.R. 597, to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–202);

H.R. 954, to remove the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–203);

H.R. 1306, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–204);

H.R. 1404, to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Tucson Unified School District and to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona (H. Rept. 115–205);

H.R. 1397, to authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal land, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–206, Part 1);

H.R. 1541, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property related to the Fort

Scott National Historic Site in Fort Scott, Kansas, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–207);

H.R. 1719, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, and for other purposes, with amendments (H. Rept. 115–208);

H.R. 1913, to establish the Clear Creek National Recreation Area in San Benito and Fresno Counties, California, to designate the Joaquin Rocks Wilderness in such counties, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–209);

H.R. 2156, to provide for the establishment of a national memorial and national monument to commemorate those killed by the collapse of the Saint Francis Dam on March 12, 1928, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–210);

H.R. 2868, to protect National Flood Insurance Program policyholders from unreasonable premium rates and to require the Program to consider the unique characteristics of urban properties, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–211);

Supplemental report on H.R. 2810, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–200, Part 2); and

H. Res. 431, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 23) to provide drought

relief in the State of California, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–212). **Pages H5431–32**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Comer to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5393**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:11 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H5394**

Public Interest Declassification Board—Appointment: Read a letter from Representative Pelosi, Minority Leader, in which she appointed the following individual to the Public Interest Declassification Board: Mr. John F. Tierney of Massachusetts. **Page H5396**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:11 p.m. and reconvened at 4 p.m. **Page H5396**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act of 2017: H.R. 702, amended, to amend the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 to strengthen Federal antidiscrimination laws enforced by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and expand accountability within the Federal Government; **Pages H5398–H5402**

Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1730 18th Street in Bakersfield, California, as the “Merle Haggard Post Office Building”: H.R. 1988, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1730 18th Street in Bakersfield, California, as the “Merle Haggard Post Office Building”; **Pages H5402–03**

Removing the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia: H.R. 954, to remove the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia; **Pages H5403–04**

Authorizing, directing, facilitating, and expediting the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal land: H.R. 1397, to authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal land, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nay vote of 406 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 345; **Pages H5404–05, H5417**

Pascua Yaqui Tribe Land Conveyance Act: H.R. 1404, to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Tucson Unified School District and to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona; **Pages H5405–07**

Authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property related to the Fort Scott Na-

tional Historic Site in Fort Scott, Kansas: H.R. 1541, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property related to the Fort Scott National Historic Site in Fort Scott, Kansas; **Pages H5407–08**

John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act: H.R. 1719, amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nay vote of 401 yeas to 15 nays, Roll No. 346; **Pages H5408–09, H5418–19**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, for inclusion in the John Muir National Historic Site, and for other purposes.”. **Page H5419**

Clear Creek National Recreation Area and Conservation Act: H.R. 1913, to establish the Clear Creek National Recreation Area in San Benito and Fresno Counties, California, to designate the Joaquin Rocks Wilderness in such counties; **Pages H5409–11**

Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act: H.R. 1306, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon; **Pages H5412–14**

Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Memorial Act: H.R. 2156, to provide for the establishment of a national memorial and national monument to commemorate those killed by the collapse of the Saint Francis Dam on March 12, 1928; and **Pages H5414–15**

Lytton Rancheria Homelands Act of 2017: H.R. 597, to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California. **Pages H5415–16**

Recess: The House recessed at 5:29 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m. **Page H5417**

Oath of Office—Thirty-Fourth Congressional District of California: Representative-elect Jimmy Gomez presented himself in the well of the House and was administered the Oath of Office by the Speaker. Earlier, the Clerk of the House transmitted a copy of a letter received from the Honorable Alex Padilla, California Secretary of State, indicating that, at the Special Election held on June 6, 2017, the Honorable Jimmy Gomez was elected Representative to Congress for the 34th Congressional District, State of California. **Pages H5417–18**

Whole Number of the House: The Speaker announced to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from California, the whole number of the House is 434. **Page H5418**

Supplemental Report: Agreed by unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to file a supplemental report on H.R. 2810,

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. **Page H5419**

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed.

Medical Controlled Substances Transportation Act of 2017: H.R. 1492, to amend the Controlled Substances Act to direct the Attorney General to register practitioners to transport controlled substances to States in which the practitioner is not registered under the Act for the purpose of administering the substances (under applicable State law) at locations other than principal places of business or professional practice. **Pages H5396–98**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency declared with respect to Sudan is to continue in effect beyond October 12, 2017—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 115–51).

Pages H5421–22

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H5396.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5417 and H5418–19. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 9:11 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies held a markup on the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2018. The Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2018, was forwarded to the full committee, without amendment.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018; GAINING RESPONSIBILITY ON WATER ACT OF 2017

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 2810, the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018”; and H.R. 23, the “Gaining Responsibility on Water Act of 2017”. The Committee granted, by record vote of 8–4, a structured rule for H.R. 2810. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and con-

trolled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–23, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the Rules Committee Report, shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in part B of the Rules Committee report and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of the rule. Provides that the amendments printed in part B of the report may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in part B of the report or against amendments en bloc as described in section 3 of this rule. The rule provides that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee may offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part B of the report not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule provides that no further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House. Additionally, the rule grants a structured rule for H.R. 23. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order as original text for the purpose of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–24 and provides that it shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in part C of the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be

debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in part C of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Thornberry, Chairman Bishop of Utah, and Representatives Huffman and Smith of Washington.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 12, 2017

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, 9:30 a.m., SD-124.

Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, business meeting to mark-up an original bill entitled, "Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018", 2:30 p.m., SD-124.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of David Joel Trachtenberg, of Virginia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary, Owen West, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary, Ryan McCarthy, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of the Army, and Charles Douglas Stimson, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Navy, all of the Department of Defense, 9:30 a.m., SD-G50.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine force multipliers, focusing on how transportation and supply chain stakeholders are combating human trafficking, 10 a.m., SR-253.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: business meeting to consider S. 822, to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to modify provisions relating to grants, S. 1447, to reauthorize the diesel emissions reduction program, S. 1359, to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize appropriations for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, S. 810, to facilitate construction of a bridge on certain property in Christian County, Missouri, S. 1395, to revise the boundaries of certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units in Delaware, General Services Administration resolutions, and the nominations of Annie Caputo, of Virginia, and David Wright, of South Carolina, each to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and Susan Parker Bodine, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Ad-

ministrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the use of the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act and innovative financing in improving infrastructure to enhance safety, mobility, and economic opportunity, 9:45 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider the nomination of Mark Andrew Green, of Wisconsin, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and routine lists in the Foreign Service; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the Taylor Force Act, 10 a.m., SD-419.

Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy, to hold hearings to examine American leadership in the Asia Pacific, focusing on promoting democracy, human rights, and the rule of law, 2:15 p.m., SD-419.

Committee on Indian Affairs: to hold hearings to examine S. 943, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an accurate comprehensive student count for the purposes of calculating formula allocations for programs under the Johnson-O'Malley Act, S. 1223, to repeal the Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Act, and S. 1285, to allow the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, and the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians to lease or transfer certain lands, 2:30 p.m., SD-628.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Christopher A. Wray, of Georgia, to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, 9:30 a.m., SD-226.

Subcommittee on Border Security and Immigration, to hold hearings to examine the problem of visa overstays, focusing on a need for better tracking and accountability, 2:30 p.m., SD-226.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine nourishing our golden years, focusing on how proper and adequate nutrition promote healthy aging and positive outcomes, 9:30 a.m., SD-562.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Full Committee, hearing entitled "The Next Farm Bill: Technology and Innovation in Specialty Crops", 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Full Committee, markup on the Agriculture Appropriations Bill, FY 2018; and the Energy and Water Appropriations Bill, FY 2018, 10:30 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, markup on the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2018, 3 p.m., 2007 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Homeland Security, markup on the Homeland Security Appropriations Bill, FY 2018, 4:30 p.m., 2008 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Redefining Joint Employer

Standards: Barriers to Job Creation and Entrepreneurship”, 10:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “Combating the Opioid Crisis: Battles in the States”, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Examining Medical Product Manufacturer Communications”, 10:15 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Monetary Policy and the State of the Economy”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing entitled “Examining Legislative Proposals to Provide Targeted Regulatory Relief to Community Financial Institutions”, 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Beyond Microfinance: Empowering Women in the Developing World”, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, hearing entitled “Advancing U.S. Interests in the Western Hemisphere: The FY 2018 Budget Request”, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, hearing entitled “Black Flags over Mindanao: Terrorism in Southeast Asia”, 2:30 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 469, the “Sunshine for Regulations and Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2017”; and H.R. 2851, the “Stop the Importation and Trafficking of Synthetic Analogues Act of 2017”, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing entitled “Evaluating Federal Offshore Oil and Gas Development on the Outer Continental Shelf”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Government Operations; and Subcommittee on Information Technology, joint hearing entitled “General Services Administration—Acquisition Oversight and Reform”, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 2810, the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018” {amendment consideration}, 3 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Research and Technology, hearing entitled “U.S. Fire Administration and Fire Grant Programs Reauthorization: Examining Effectiveness and Priorities”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Help or Hindrance? A Review of SBA’s Office of the Chief Information Officer”, 11 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, hearing entitled “Implementing the Federal Assets Sale and Transfer Act (FASTA): Maximizing Taxpayer Returns and Reducing Waste in Real Estate”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Care Where It Counts: Assessing VA’s Capital Asset Needs”, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, markup on H.R. 2006, the “VA Procurement Efficiency and Transparency Act”; H.R. 2749, the “Protecting Business Opportunities for Veterans Act of 2017”; H.R. 2781, the “Ensuring Veteran Enterprise Participation in Strategic Sourcing Act”; and H.R. 3169, the “VA Acquisition Workforce Improvement and Streamlining Act”, 1 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, markup on H.R. 282, the “Military Residency Choice Act”; H.R. 1690, the “Department of Veterans Affairs Bonus Transparency Act”; and H.R. 2772, the “SEA Act”, 2 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Joint Meetings

Joint Economic Committee: to hold hearings to examine a record six million United States job vacancies, focusing on reasons and remedies, 10 a.m., 2020, Rayburn Building.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 noon, Wednesday, July 12

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, July 12

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of David C. Nye, of Idaho, to be United States District Judge for the District of Idaho, and vote on confirmation thereon.

Following disposition of the nomination of David C. Nye, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Francis Hagerty IV, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador to Japan.

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 23—Gaining Responsibility on Water Act of 2017 (Subject to a Rule). Consideration of H.R. 2810—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Subject to a Rule). Consideration of measures under suspension of the Rules.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bergman, Jack, Mich., E957
 Beyer, Donald S., Jr., Va., E961
 Brady, Kevin, Tex., E960
 Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E959
 Carson, André, Ind., E959
 Castro, Joaquin, Tex., E962
 Collins, Doug, Ga., E954, E958, E961
 Comstock, Barbara, Va., E955
 Cook, Paul, Calif., E955
 Correa, J. Luis, Calif., E960

Davidson, Warren, Ohio, E962
 DeFazio, Peter A., Ore., E954
 Esty, Elizabeth H., Conn., E954
 Gosar, Paul, Ariz., E961
 Granger, Kay, Tex., E953
 Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E958
 Huizenga, Bill, Mich., E959
 Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E957
 Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E962
 LaHood, Darin, Ill., E959
 Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E953
 Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E956, E958

Messer, Luke, Ind., E956
 Norcross, Donald, N.J., E954, E955, E955, E956, E958,
 E958, E959, E960, E961, E961
 Rice, Tom, S.C., E961
 Rooney, Francis, Fla., E954
 Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E955, E960
 Trott, David A., Mich., E955
 Velázquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E959
 Wittman, Robert J., Va., E953
 Young, David, Iowa, E956



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.